WARRIOR WOMEN

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM SEXAGESIMUM SECUNDUM

DEBORAH GERA

WARRIOR WOMEN

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

WARRIOR WOMEN

THE ANONYMOUS *TRACTATUS DE MULIERIBUS*

BY

DEBORAH GERA

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1997

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gera, Deborah Levine.
Warrior women : the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus / by Deborah Gera.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 162)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004106650 (alk. paper)
1. Tractatus de mulieribus claris in bello. 2. Women—Greece—History. 3. Women soldiers—Greece—History. 4. Queens —Greece—History. I. Title. II. Series.
HQ1134.G47. 1996
305.4'09495—dc20 96-9610
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
162. Gera, Deborah: Warrior women. – 1996
Gera, Deborah:
Warrior women : the anonymus Tractatus De Mulieribus / by Deborah Gera. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1996
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 162)
ISBN 90-04-10665-0

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10665 0

© Copyright 1997 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Dov, Avital, Chemi, and Ariel
and for my mother, Ivriah Levine,
an *eshet chayil*, a woman of valor.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ix
Abbreviations xi

I. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE *DE MULIERIBUS*

Preliminary Remarks 3
Text and Translation 5
The Women of *DM*: A Survey 11
War, Weaving, and Wiles: Gender Roles 18
The Form, Sources, and Structure of *DM* 26
The Genre of *DM* 32
Catalogues of Women 40
The Anonymous Author: Some Speculations 56

II. THE INDIVIDUAL WOMEN

Semiramis 65
Zarinaea 84
Nitocris the Egyptian 101
Nitocris the Babylonian 106
Argeia 121
Dido 126
Atossa 141
Rhodogyne 151
Lyde 159
Pheretime 164
Thargelia 179
Tomyris 187
Artemisia 205
Onomaris 219

Bibliography 225
Index Locorum 237
General Index 247

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book has taken a long time to formulate and write. I first encountered the text of *De Mulieribus* nearly fifteen years ago and have been intrigued by it ever since. Over the years I have incurred several debts, especially to colleagues and friends at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

It is a pleasure to thank Hannah Rosén for her encouragement and gentle prodding. She lent her considerable expertise in Celtic matters, but should not be held responsible for the end result in the section on Onomaris. Joseph Geiger has been urging me to write about "your women" for many years and had helpful comments to make on the introduction. Samuel Scolnicov read an earlier draft of the work and offered advice on questions of form and content. David Satran is a constant source of challenging conversation and coffee.

I am also most grateful to Brill's anonymous reader for her incisive criticisms and corrections. She provided much valuable and detailed advice, relating both to the content and presentation of the material. Richard Hawley also read the whole of an earlier draft.

This book is dedicated, with love, to various members of my family, all of whom teach me much about women, intelligence, and courage.

D.L.G.
April 1996

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	*L'antiquité classique*
AJAH	*American Journal of Ancient History*
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
ASNP	*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
CA	*Classical Antiquity*
C&M	*Classica et Mediaevalia*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
DB	Darius, Behistun Inscription
DK	H. Diels & W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*[6] (Berlin 1951)
FGrH	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden 1923–1957)
FHG	C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Paris 1853–1870)
GGM	C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* (Paris 1855–1861)
G&R	*Greece and Rome*
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
Pack[2]	R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*[2] (Ann Arbor 1965)
PCG	R. Kassel & C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin and New York 1983–)
PMG	D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962)
P. Oxy.	*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London 1898–)
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. A. Fr. von Pauly, rev. G. Wissowa *et al.* (Stuttgart 1894–1980)
REA	*Revue des études anciennes*
REL	*Revue des études latines*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
SCI	*Scripta Classica Israelica*
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

PART ONE

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE *DE MULIERIBUS*

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

ἡ γυναικεία φύσις οὐδὲν χείρων τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὖσα τυγχάνει, γνώμης δὲ καὶ ἰσχύος δεῖται. (Xenophon *Symposium* 2. 9)

The anonymous *Tractatus De Mulieribus Claris In Bello* (henceforth *DM*) is virtually unknown. This brief work, a mere six pages long, consists of a series of short notices telling of fourteen outstanding women, Greek and barbarian, who performed some notable deed, principally on the battlefield. Some of these women, such as Semiramis or Artemisia were quite well known in the Greek world, while others are fairly obscure figures. The notices are based on accounts of these women found in (mainly) fifth and fourth century BC writers and the anonymous author (henceforth ADM) generally names his source. One of these ancient writers, Herodotus, has survived in entirety, but all the others—Ctesias, Aeschines the Socratic, Timaeus etc.—are authors of whom only fragments remain. The complete text of *DM* has been published just three times. Heeren produced the first printed edition in 1789 and added a preface and brief notes to his text. In 1839 Westermann included the work in his collection, ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ: *Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci*, while in 1895 Landi published a new transcription of the chief manuscript of *DM*.[1]

DM is an anonymous work and there is no indication of the author's date, background, or intentions in assembling the collection. The work has no preface setting out the writer's aims and methods, such as is found, for instance, in Plutarch's catalogue of outstanding women, *Virtues of Women*, and our work simply opens with the account of the first woman, Semiramis. We cannot even be certain that the title given the work in the mss., *Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare* (γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι) is that assigned by the original author. This lack of information about ADM and his intentions lends the contexts of transmission and publication greater significance, perhaps, than they deserve. In three of the four main

[1] See Heeren 1789; Westermann 1839 (a photographic reproduction was issued in Amsterdam in 1963); Landi 1895.

mss., *DM* is found in close proximity to the text of Polyaenus' *Strategemata*,[2] a collection in eight books of various military stratagems, presented in the form of brief anecdotes. *DM* itself comes after two short works of paradoxography describing natural marvels and is followed in turn by a series of brief, bare catalogues listing houses destroyed by women, instances of brotherly love, etc.[3] Westermann states that he includes the *DM* in his *Paradoxographoi* simply because earlier scholars thought that it was written by Phlegon, the author of a work on marvels; in other words, *DM* is included in Westermann's collection only for completeness' sake.[4] But the fact that our collection of women is found in the mss. in a context of lists of unusual phenomena and is most readily accessible in a work entitled *Paradoxographoi* suggests to the reader that the women described in *DM* are somehow strange and paradoxical figures, paraded before us so that we can gape and stare, rather than appreciate their unusual qualities. This perception of the women of *DM*—that they are, above all, paradoxical creatures—need not be that of the original author and his intended audience. Polyaenus' collection of military stratagems, found, as we have seen, in the mss. together with *DM* casts its shadow as well, for in the very title of *DM*, *Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare* (γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι),[5] full weight is given to the warlike adventures of these women: their non-bellicose activities have disappeared, even though some of the 14 women clearly never set foot on the battlefield. Finally, the catalogue format of the work and the lists that immediately follow *DM* abet, perhaps, the tendency to approach the composition—if at all—in piecemeal fashion for the information it supplies on one of the women or on a fragmentary author who appears as a source, rather than viewing the work as a whole.

Consequently it seems best to begin a study of *DM* with a preliminary reading of the entire work; a text and facing translation of *DM* are found immediately below. An introduction to the text then follows. The aim of the introduction is, first, to summarize the salient features of *DM*: its form (the language, sources, and formal structure

---

[2] Dain 1950, 430.
[3] Rose 1864, 7; Dain 1950, 428–30.
[4] Westermann 1839, xli. Giannini does not include *DM* in his 1965 edition of *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae*.
[5] Cf. the usual Latin title *De Mulieribus Quae Bello Claruerunt* or *De Mulieribus Claris In Bello*.

of the notices) and content (the women, recurring themes etc.). The introduction also deals with the wider issues raised by the collection, in particular questions of genre and cultural context. The notices of *DM*, brief as they are, exhibit an unusual combination of several different genres found in ancient literature, including compositions on a series of figures who belong to a narrowly defined group, collections of *exempla*, and catalogues or lists of women. Special emphasis is given to this last element, for it is perhaps most helpful to approach *DM* as a catalogue of women. Since the women of *DM* are singled out for their intelligence, initiative, and courage, ancient attitudes towards women's capabilities, particularly their ability to wage war and to govern, are also examined. Finally, in lieu of a conclusion, an attempt will be made to see what can be learned about the identity, times, methods, and purposes of ADM, the anonymous author.

The introduction is followed by detailed essay-commentaries on the individual notices of the women. These essays are generally literary in orientation. A discussion of the date and historical background of each woman is included, but many of the women of *DM* are shadowy figures and it is often difficult to establish their historical existence. My chief aim is to sketch the fullest possible portrait of each individual woman and consequently I have examined related sources telling of the woman, and investigated—wherever possible—the role she plays in the original source. The account in *DM* is also compared to that of the original work, if it is extant, in order to investigate the accuracy and interests of ADM.

Text and Translation

There are four main mss. of *DM*: F (Laurentianus 56–1) is the prototype; V1 (Marcianus 414) and U (Urbinas graeca 107) were copied from F by Michael Apostolis towards the end of the fifteenth century, and E3 (Escorialensis T–I–12) was then copied from V1.[6] Heeren 1789 is the first printed edition and Westermann's edition of 1839 is the second; Landi transcribed the text of F in 1895. The following

[6] See Schindler 1973, 15–18, 76–85 and Dain 1950 for a detailed description of the mss., their histories, and relationships. Dain 1950, 439; Heeren 1789, 3–5; and Rose 1864, 1–8, 13–14 also discuss the roles played by Lucas Holsten and Thomas Tychsen in the transmission of *DM*.

eclectic text is based on the editions of Heeren, Westermann, and Landi, as well as that of Jacoby for those notices which appear in *FGrH* as fragments.[7] There is no translation of the entire text of *DM* into any modern language, as far as I have seen; various individual notices have been translated. Three dots . . . indicate a lacuna in the text, while angular brackets < > indicate an addition.

1. Σεμίραμις. θυγάτηρ μέν, ὥς φησι Κτησίας, Δερκετοῦς τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ καὶ Σύρου τινός, ἥτις ἐτράφη ὑπὸ Σίμμα, ὄντος ὑπηρέτου τοῦ βασιλέως Νίνου. γαμηθεῖσα δὲ Ὀννέῳ, ὑπάρχῳ τινὶ βασιλικῷ, εἶχεν υἱοὺς ⟨β'⟩. ἑλοῦσα δὲ Βάκτρα μετὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἐπιγνοὺς Νίνος ἤδη γηραιὸς ὢν ἐγάμησεν. ἡ δὲ ἐτέκνωσεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ Νινύαν παῖδα. μετὰ δὲ τὸν Νίνου θάνατον ἐτείχισε τὴν Βαβυλῶνα ὀπτῇ πλίνθῳ καὶ ἀσφάλτῳ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Βήλου ἱερὸν κατεσκεύασεν. ἐπιβουλευθεῖσα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ Νινύου ἐτελεύτησεν, ἔτη βιώσασα ξ⟨β⟩', βασιλεύσασα ἔτη μβ'.

1. Semiramis. The daughter, as Ctesias says, of Derceto the Syrian goddess and a Syrian man. She was raised by Simmas, a servant of the king, Ninus. She was married to Onnes, a governor of the king and had < 2 > sons. When she captured Bactra with her husband, Ninus, who was already an old man, became acquainted with her and married her. She bore him a son, Ninyas. After Ninus' death, she fortified Babylon with baked brick and bitumen and built the temple of Belus. She was conspired against by her son Ninyas and died, having lived for 6 < 2 > years and ruled for 42.

2. Ζαριναία. αὕτη τελευτήσαντος τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ ἀδελφοῦ Κυδραίου, Σακῶν βασιλέως, ἐγαμήθη Μερμέρῳ τῆς Παρθυαίων χώρας δυνάστῃ. τοῦ δὲ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἐπιστρατεύσαντος, πολεμοῦσα καὶ τρωθεῖσα ἔφυγε, διωχθεῖσα δὲ ὑπὸ Στρυαγγαίου ἱκετεύουσα διεσώθη. μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ὑποχείριον αὐτὸν ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς λαβὼν ἐβούλετο ἀνελεῖν· ἡ δὲ δεομένη σῴζειν καὶ μὴ πείθουσα, λύσασά τινας τῶν ἑαλωκότων σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸν Μέρμερον ἀνεῖλε, καὶ παραδοῦσα τῷ Πέρσῃ τὴν χώραν φιλίαν ἐποιήσατο πρὸς αὐτόν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κτησίας.

2. Zarinaea. She, after her first husband, and brother, Cydraeus, king of the Sacians, died, was married to Mermerus, ruler of the Parthian territory. When the Persian king attacked, she fought and after being wounded, fled. She was pursued by Stryangaeus, pleaded for her life and was saved. Shortly afterwards her husband captured him and wanted to kill him. She asked to save him, but when she failed to persuade her husband, she released several of the prisoners and with them killed Mermerus. She surrendered the territory to the Persian and became his ally, as Ctesias relates.

[7] Nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10; see source table below, p. 28.

3. Νίτωκρις, Αἰγύπτου βασίλισσα, περὶ ἧς Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων ἀναιρεθέντος τοὺς μάλιστα αἰτίους συγκαλέσασα καὶ ἔν τινι ἐπιμήκει οἴκῳ ἑστιῶσα διά τινος αὐλῶνος τὸν ποταμὸν αὐτοῖς ἐπεισήγαγεν, ἑαυτὴν δὲ εἰς οἴκημά τι σποδοῦ πλῆρες ἐνέβαλεν.

3. Nitocris, the queen of Egypt, of whom Herodotus tells. When her brother was killed by Egyptians, she invited those who were particularly responsible and entertained them in a huge chamber. She let the river in on them through a channel and flung herself into a room full of ashes.

4. Νίτωκρις Βαβυλωνία. ταύτην φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος φρονιμωτέραν Σεμιράμιδος γενέσθαι βασίλισσαν. τόν τε γὰρ ποταμὸν γεφυρῶσαι ἐν τῇ πόλει, τήν τε λίμνην ὀρύξαι καὶ κρηπιδῶσαι κρηπῖδι λιθίνῃ, τό τε ῥεῦμα τοῦ ποταμοῦ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς τὸ βραδυτέραν τὴν τῶν πολεμίων ἔφοδον εἶναι. καὶ τὸν τάφον δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πύλῃ τὸν ἴδιον ταύτην φησὶ ποιῆσαι, τὸν ἐξαπατήσαντα Δαρεῖον, ὃς ὑπονοῶν ἀργύρια εὑρεῖν καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸν τάφον ταῦτα μὲν οὐχ εὗρε, γράμματα δὲ ἀπληστίαν πολλὴν καὶ αἰσχροκέρδειαν αὐτῷ ὀνειδίζοντα.

4. Nitocris the Babylonian. She, says Herodotus, was a wiser queen than Semiramis. For she built a bridge over the river in the city and excavated a basin and furnished it with a stone coping, and diverted the flow of the river into it, to slow down the access of enemies. She also, he says, constructed her own tomb over the gate, which fooled Darius, who thought that he would find money. When he opened the tomb, he found no money, but an inscription reproaching his great greed and love of money.

5. Ἀργεία, τὸ μὲν γένος ἔχουσα ἀπὸ Πολυνείκους. ταύτην φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος τεκεῖν διδύμους παῖδας, καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς Ἀριστοδήμου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέως μὴ θελῆσαι εἰπεῖν τὸν πρεσβύτερον τῶν βρεφῶν, ἀμφοτέροιν ἐξ ἴσου τὴν βασιλείαν περιθεῖναι θέλουσαν· ἐφόδῳ μέντοι γενέσθαι φανερὸν τῷ πρῶτον ὑπ' αὐτῆς καὶ λούεσθαι καὶ τρέφεσθαι τὸν πρεσβύτερον.

5. Argeia was descended from Polyneices. She, Herodotus says, gave birth to twin sons and after the death of her husband Aristodemus, king of the Spartans, refused to tell who was the older of the two infants, because she wanted to confer the throne equally upon the pair. But the elder was discovered by logical means, when he was washed and fed by her first.

6. Θειοσσώ. ταύτην φησὶ Τίμαιος κατὰ μὲν τὴν Φοινίκων γλῶσσαν Ἐλίσσαν καλεῖσθαι, ἀδελφὴν δὲ εἶναι Πυγμαλίωνος τοῦ Τυρίων βασιλέως, ὑφ' ἧς φησι τὴν Καρχηδόνα τὴν ἐν Λιβύῃ κτισθῆναι. τοῦ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πυγμαλίωνος ἀναιρεθέντος ἐνθεμένη τὰ χρήματα εἰς σκάφας μετά τινων πολιτῶν ἔφευγε, καὶ πολλὰ

6. Theiosso. She, says Timaeus, was called Elissa in the Phoenician tongue and was the sister of Pygmalion, the king of the Tyrians. He says that Carthage in Libya was founded by her. For after her husband was killed by Pygmalion, she placed her money in boats and fled with some fellow citizens. After suf-

κακοπαθήσασα τῇ Λιβύῃ προσηνέχθη, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Λιβύων διὰ τὴν πολλὴν αὐτῆς πλάνην Δειδὼ προσηγορεύθη ἐπιχωρίως. κτίσασα δὲ τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν, τοῦ τῶν Λιβύων βασιλέως θέλοντος αὐτὴν γῆμαι, αὐτὴ μὲν ἀντέλεγεν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν πολιτῶν συναναγκαζομένη, σκηψαμένη τελετήν τινα πρὸς ἀνάλυσιν ὅρκων ἐπιτελέσειν, πυρὰν μεγίστην ἐγγὺς τοῦ οἴκου κατασκευάσασα καὶ ἅψασα, ἀπὸ τοῦ δώματος αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν πυρὰν ἔρριψεν.

fering much, she reached Libya and was called Dido by the Libyans in the local tongue, because of her many wanderings. After she founded the above city, the king of the Libyans wanted to marry her. She refused, but was compelled by her compatriots to comply. Pretending that she had to perform a certain rite to annul her vows, she prepared and lit a great pyre near her palace. She then threw herself from the house into the fire.

7. Ἄτοσσα. ταύτην φησὶν Ἑλλάνικος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἀριάσπου ὡς ἄρρενα τραφεῖσαν διαδέξασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν. κρύβουσαν δὲ τὴν τῶν γυναίων ἐπίνοιαν, τιάραν πρώτην φορέσαι, πρώτην δὲ καὶ ἀναξυρίδας καὶ τὴν τῶν εὐνούχων ὑπουργίαν εὑρεῖν καὶ διὰ βίβλων τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ποιεῖσθαι. πολλὰ δὲ ὑποτάξασα ἔθνη πολεμικωτάτη καὶ ἀνδρειοτάτη ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἐγένετο.

7. Atossa. She, says Hellanicus, was raised by her father Ariaspes as a male and inherited the kingdom. Hiding her feminine mentality, she was the first to wear a tiara, the first to wear trousers, and to invent the use of eunuchs and make her replies in writing. She ruled many tribes and was most warlike and brave in every deed.

8. Ῥοδογύνη, ἡ Περσῶν βασίλισσα, ὥς φησιν Αἰσχίνης ὁ φιλόσοφος, μεγίστην ἐποίησε τὴν Περσῶν βασιλείαν. οὕτως γάρ φησιν ἀνδρείαν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ φοβερὰν γενέσθαι, ὥστε ποτὲ περὶ τὴν ἄσκησιν τῶν τριχῶν οὖσαν, ἀκούσασαν ἀποστάντα τινὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἀφιέναι μὲν ἡμιτέλεστον τὴν πλοκήν, μὴ πρότερον δὲ ἀναπλέξασθαι πρὶν καταλαβοῦσαν ὑποτάξαι τὰ προειρημένα ἔθνη. διὸ καὶ εἰκὼν αὐτῆς ἀνετέθη χρυσέα, τὰς μὲν ἡμίσεις ἔχουσα τρίχας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀναπεπλεγμένας, τὰς δὲ ἡμίσεις καθειμένας.

8. Rhodogyne, queen of the Persians, as Aeschines the philosopher says, made the Persian kingdom most powerful. For she was, he says, so brave in her deeds and so frightening that once, while in the midst of arranging her hair, she heard that several tribes had rebelled. She left her hair semi-braided and did not braid it until she had captured and subdued the aforementioned tribes. That is why a golden statue of her was dedicated, with half her hair braided round her head and the other half flowing loose.

9. Λύδη. ταύτην φησὶν Ξενόφιλος, ὁ τὰς Λυδικὰς ἱστορίας γράψας, γυναῖκά τε καὶ ἀδελφὴν εἶναι Ἀλυάτεω τοῦ Κροίσου προπάτορος. ταύτης υἱὸς Ἀλυάτης διαδεξάμενος τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς

9. Lyde. She, says Xenophilus, the author of the *Lydian Histories*, was the wife and sister of Alyattes, the grandfather of Croesus. When her son Alyattes inherited his father's king-

βασιλείαν ἐγένετο δεινῶς ὑβριστής, ὡς καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ἀξιολόγων ἀνδρῶν περισχίσαι καὶ προσπτύειν πολλοῖς. αὐτὴ δὲ τὸν μὲν υἱὸν ὅσον ἐδύνατο κατέστελλεν, τοὺς δὲ ὑβριζομένους καὶ λόγοις χρηστοῖς καὶ ἔργοις ἠμείβετο. πᾶσαν δὲ τῷ υἱῷ φιλοφροσύνην προσφέρουσα εἰς στοργὴν ἑαυτῆς πολλὴν αὐτὸν περιέτρεψε. νομίσασα δὲ αὐτάρκως ἀγαπᾶσθαι, σκηψαμένη ἀσθένειαν σίτου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπέσχετο, τὸν δὲ παρεδρεύοντα καὶ ὁμοίως ἀσιτοῦντα κατασταλῆναι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο μεταβάλλεσθαι, ὥστε, φησίν, ὀρθότατον καὶ δικαιότατον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι.

dom, he became terribly violent, tearing the clothes of respectable men and spitting in the face of many. She restrained her son as much as she could, and reconciled those insulted by him with noble words and deeds. Showing every kindness to her son, she brought him round to great affection towards her. When she thought she was sufficiently loved, she pretended to be weak and abstained from food and all the rest. He attended her and also did not eat and became so subdued and changed that he became, he says, the most honest and just of men.

10. Φερετίμη, γυνὴ Βάττου. αὕτη τελευτήσαντος αὐτῆς τοῦ παιδὸς δόλῳ αὐτὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Κυρήνης κατέσχε, καὶ τὸν υἱδοῦν βασιλέα καταστήσασα τοὺς ἀντιταξαμένους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτῆς Ἀρκεσίλᾳ κατὰ θάλατταν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπέστειλεν. ἐπιπαραγενομένη δὲ αὐτὴ πάντας ἀνεῖλε, συμπείσασα τὸν ἔχοντα τὴν Αἰγύπτου ἀρχὴν τότε Ἀρυάνδην. λαβοῦσα δὲ δύναμιν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τοὺς Κυρηναίους πικρῶς ἐχειρώσατο, καὶ ἀναχωρήσασα εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐτελεύτησε, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Μενεκλῆς, ὁ τὰς Λιβυκὰς ἱστορίας γράψας.

10. Pheretime, wife of Battus. She when her son died by trickery took over the rule of Cyrene herself. After establishing her grandson as king, she sent those who had opposed her son Arcesilaus to Egypt, by sea. When she appeared on the scene herself, she killed them all, having won over as an ally the ruler of Egypt at the time, Aryandes. She received forces from the < Persian > king and subdued the Cyrenians harshly. She then withdrew to Egypt and died, as Menecles, the author of the *Libyan Histories*, relates.

11. Θαργηλία Μιλησία. ταύτην φασὶν Ἀντιόχου βασιλεύοντος τῶν Θετταλῶν ἀφικομένην εἰς Θετταλίαν γήμασθαι Ἀντιόχῳ καὶ ἀποθανόντος ἐκείνου βασιλεῦσαι Θετταλίας ἔτη λ', καὶ τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα, ὅτε ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐστρατεύετο, δέξασθαι καὶ ἀποπέμψαι μηδὲν ἐλαττωθεῖσαν.

11. Thargelia the Milesian. She, they say, came to Thessaly when Antiochus was king of the Thessalians. She was married to Antiochus and after his death she ruled over Thessaly for 30 years. When the Persian king came to attack Greece, she received him and sent him away, in no way diminished.

12. Τώμυρις Μασσαγετῶν βασίλισσα. αὕτη καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Ἡρόδοτος ἄσπονδον αὐτῇ πόλεμον Κύρου καταγ-

12. Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae. She, as Herodotus relates, when Cyrus declared implacable war

γείλαντος, ἔχουσα καὶ υἱόν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον συνεβούλευε τῷ Κύρῳ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις μένοντι ἡσυχάζειν, εἰ δ' ἄρα ἐπιθυμοίη πολεμεῖν, ἀναχωρήσαντα τῆς χώρας τριῶν ἡμερῶν διάστημα δέξασθαι αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ἢ εἰς τὴν αὐτῆς ὁμοίως εἰσιέναι. τοῦ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν χωρήσαντος καὶ μάχῃ νικήσαντος καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ζῶντα αὐτῆς λαβόντος, πέμψασα πάλιν συνεβούλευεν ἀρκεσθέντα τῇ νίκῃ ἀποδόντα τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῇ ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν. ἀπειθοῦντος δέ, ἐπεὶ ἔγνω τὸν παῖδα αὐτοχειρὶ διαφθαρῆναι σύμπαντι τῷ στρατεύματι ἐπελθοῦσα οὐ μόνον ἐνίκησεν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν πεσόντα ἀναζητήσασα ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς νεκρὸν ᾐκίσατο.

against her (she had a son), at first advised Cyrus to stay peaceably in his own territory; but if he in fact desired to go to war, to withdraw a distance of three days into his territory and receive her with her army or else invade her territory in a similar manner. After he came to her and was victorious in battle and captured her son alive, she again sent a message. She advised him to be satisfied with his victory, return her son to her, and turn back to his own land. When he refused, since she knew that her son had died by his own hand, she attacked with her entire army; not only was she victorious but she searched for the fallen Cyrus and mutilated his corpse in recompense for her son.

13. Ἀρτεμισία, Ἁλικαρνασσίς, θυγάτηρ Λυγδάμιος, ὥς φησιν Ἡρόδοτος. αὕτη διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνδρείαν ἐπεστράτευσε τῷ Πέρσῃ, ἄρχουσα Ἁλικαρνασσέων, Κῴων, Νισυρίων. ταύτης, φησί, τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὰς γνώμας ὁ Πέρσης θαυμάζων ἀνέκραγεν, ὡς αἱ γυναῖκες μὲν αὐτῷ ἄνδρες, οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες γυναῖκες αὐτῷ γεγόνασιν. ὅθεν καὶ μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν τῇ μὲν Ἀρτεμισίᾳ πανοπλίαν ἔπεμψε, τοῖς δὲ τῶν Φοινίκων στρατηγοῖς ἠλακάτας καὶ ἀτράκτους, τῆς μὲν τιμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῖς τῆς ἀνδρίας ἐπισήμοις, τῶν δὲ ἐξελέγχων τὴν μαλακίαν τοῖς τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν.

13. Artemisia, the Halicarnassian, the daughter of Lygdamis, as Herodotus says. She, due to her personal bravery, went to war together with the Persian, when she ruled the Halicarnassians, Coans, and Nisurians. The Persian, he says, admiring her deeds and good sense, cried aloud that his women had become men and his men women. Hence after the naval battle, he sent Artemisia a suit of armor and the Phoenician commanders distaffs and spindles, honoring her courage with the tokens of bravery and reproving their weakness by means of these womanly pursuits.

14. Ὀνόμαρις, μία τῶν ἐν ἀξιώματι Γαλατῶν, καταπονουμένων ὑπ' ἀφορίας τῶν ὁμοφύλων καὶ ζητούντων φυγεῖν ἐκ τῆς χώρας. παραδιδόντων δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐν ὑποταγῇ τῷ θέλοντι ἀφηγεῖσθαι, μηδενὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν θέλοντος τήν τε οὐσίαν πᾶσαν εἰς μέσον ἔθηκε καὶ τῆς ἀποικίας ἀφηγήσατο, πολλῶν

14. Onomaris, one of the distinguished Galatians. Her fellow tribesmen were oppressed by scarcity and sought to flee their land. They offered to obey whoever wanted to lead them, and when none of the men was willing, Onomaris placed all their property in common and

ὄντων ὡς εἰς . . . διαβᾶσά τε τὸν Ἴστρον καὶ τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους μάχῃ νικήσασα τῆς χώρας ἐβασίλευσεν.

led the emigration, with many people, approximately . . . She crossed the Ister and, after defeating the local inhabitants in battle, ruled over the land.

The Women of *DM*: A Survey[8]

There are 14 women in all, both Greek and barbarian, and all fourteen have many features in common. All are seemingly historical personages: there are no goddesses and no mythological figures in the work.[9] The women of *DM* are figures from the early stages of history and only one, the elusive Onomaris, was active later than the first part of the 5th century BC. ADM mentions the ethnic origins of 13 of the 14 women, and they are a far-flung and varied lot.[10] Nine of the ten barbarian women are of different nationalities—(As)syrian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Massagetan, Sacian, Phoenician, Persian, Lydian, and Celtic—and the four Greek women are all from different locations: Sparta, Cyrene, Miletus, and Halicarnassus. The wide geographical and ethnic distribution of these women may be intentional: it seems as if ADM deliberately chose one representative from each nation or polis.[11] Despite the diverse nationalities of these women, the majority are of Near Eastern origin and this may well be due to the actual prominence and power of women in various

---

[8] This survey is based on information found in the original writers cited by ADM, in addition to the facts provided by the bare notices of *DM*. I am assuming that when ADM chose the women to be included in his collection he was acquainted with the fuller versions found in these sources (below, p. 31), and this acquaintance must have influenced his choice of women and authors. *DM* may, of course, be based entirely on an earlier catalogue, which would mean that an earlier compiler, a proto-ADM, so to speak, read the original sources and chose the women to be included, while ADM merely selected tales of women from this earlier collection. But turning back to this supposed earlier anthology is not really helpful methodologically: all the following generalizations and speculations about the author's intentions and outlook can simply be attributed to proto-ADM. While it is likely that earlier anthologies did serve as a *basis* for *DM*, it is clear that ADM selected and edited the material (below, p. 57).

[9] Semiramis, daughter of a Syrian goddess, is a borderline mythological figure; she is a "heroine", i.e. a female version of the half-divine, half-mortal heroes.

[10] Atossa, the Persian-Assyrian queen, is the only woman whose nationality is not mentioned in her notice.

[11] See below, p. 56.

kingdoms of the ancient Near East, albeit at widely different places and periods.[12]

The Persian ruler is a recurring figure in the notices of *DM*. Rhodogyne and Atossa *are* Persian rulers; Zarinaea, Pheretime, Thargelia, and Artemisia are allies of the Persian king; Tomyris kills one Persian ruler and the Babylonian Nitocris dupes another. The Persian ruler, the outstanding instance of a powerful figure, acts a touchstone of sorts and the women of *DM* measure up to the challenge.[13] Thargelia is a good example of this: we are told that she entertains the Persian king and sends him on his way and is not at all diminished by the encounter.

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of the women of *DM* is that they are all queens: there are no poets, priestesses, philosophers or ordinary individuals here. The majority of these women govern in their own right, as independent rulers, and all are members of a ruling household. The noun βασίλισσα—which can be used of royal consorts and kings' daughters, as well as independent sovereigns—[14] and the verb ἐβασίλευσε feature so prominently in the description of these figures that it is surprising that *DM* is not entitled βασίλισσαι ἀνδρεῖαι κ.τ.λ. rather than γυναῖκες. All the women show initiative of some kind and they generally display their intelligence and courage in the public arena, be it political, civic, or military. Their chief interest lies in power: the allocation, preservation or establishment of political sovereignty.

Male relatives

Nearly all the women of *DM* are "placed" or identified in the context of their male relatives: we generally hear of their fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons. Rhodogyne and Onomaris are the only

---

[12] Lesko 1989 and Durand 1987 are useful collections on the role and position of women in various cultures in the ancient Near East; cf. Westenholz 1990. For brief surveys of politically active royal women in Sumer, Ebla, Egypt, Mari, Israel, Assyria, Babylonia etc. see Andreasen 1983, 182–183; Ben-Barak 1987; Reade 1987; Lambert 1987, 125–126; Harris 1989, 146–147. Brosius 1996 deals at length with Persian (royal) women and Tyldesley 1994 is the most recent of several works on Egyptian women; she discusses female kings at 208–241.

[13] At times, in the original tales of these women, the emphasis is not so much on their capabilities as on the weakness of the Persian king who is out-maneuvered by a mere female—see below e.g. on Zarinaea (p. 95), Nitocris Bab. (p. 120) and Artemisia (p. 210).

[14] Carney 1991, 156 and 164; cf. Brosius 1996, 18–20.

two women who appear on their own with no mention of any men, while Semiramis is the only figure whose mother is mentioned (in addition to the queen's father, male guardian, two husbands, and three sons), and her mother is, after all, a goddess. We hear nothing of the daughters of the women of *DM*. The male relatives mentioned by ADM serve not only to identify these women, but to explain their ascent to the throne, for almost all the women of *DM* are the wives, widows, and/or mothers of reigning kings. In other words, these women generally achieve their position as independent rulers through birth or marriage, virtually the only way a woman could become a ruler in her own right.[15] But even if they ascend to the throne because of their family connections, the women of *DM* are generally powerful figures who are much more than genealogical links.

Widows

Most of the queens of *DM* who rule independently are widows, and generally they have inherited their kingdoms from their husbands.[16] Thus, if for most mythical heroines marriage and children are the culmination of their stories, the moment beyond which literally nothing happens,[17] for many of the women of *DM* life begins in earnest in widowhood, when marriage is over. Widows who do not remarry have been recognized as liminal or anomalous figures—masculine, dangerous, and powerful—and this is manifestly true of the widows of *DM*.[18]

None of the widows in our work seems interested in remarrying. In several instances (e.g. Tomyris, Artemisia), the widow queens of *DM* are much more famous than their spouses, and the sole function of these obscure husbands seems to be to die and bequeath their thrones. Two of the widows, the Egyptian Nitocris and Dido, are intensely loyal to their first husbands, while others, such as Tomyris and Semiramis, reject would-be wooers and retain their independence. Zarinaea is the only widow who does remarry and she ends

---

[15] Ehlers 1966, 49 n. 52; Lefkowitz 1986, 87; Fraser 1988, 21 terms this the Appendage Syndrome.

[16] Again, Rhodogyne and Onomaris seem to be more independent figures. Atossa inherits her kingdom from her father, who presumably has no sons.

[17] Lefkowitz 1981, 41–47.

[18] Buitelaar 1995 is a very useful discussion of the role played by widows in (ancient) society; Walcot 1991 surveys their reputation in classical antiquity. See too Rosaldo 1974, 32–33.

up arranging the murder of this second husband. Semiramis displays perhaps the most cynical attitude towards men and marriage. Her two marriages, first to Onnes and then to Ninus, are the stepping stones which bring her to power.[19] Once on the throne, she refuses to remarry; instead she takes lovers and then kills them off so that they will not impinge on her authority. Love stories generally play little part in the lives of the women of *DM* and none of the women in *DM* is happily married: those women who are not widowed are without male partners.[20] The only romantic attachment alluded to, that between Zarinaea and Stryangaeus, ends in the latter's suicide, but ADM does not go into the details of Zarinaea's sorry love affair and he clearly is not concerned with such ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα.

Sons

It seems that power and romance do not mix well and the kind of love most often displayed by the women of *DM* is maternal love. Tomyris and Pheretime avenge the death of their sons, Argeia tries to help both her sons, while Lyde wants to improve her son's character. Even the powerful Semiramis does not prevent her son from plotting against her.

This last group of women are not only the widows of kings, and (in some instances) independent rulers, but queen mothers, parents of the reigning or future king. In many Near Eastern monarchies, queen mothers were the highest-ranking and most powerful women at court, even more important than the king's wife, and we shall encounter several historical queen mothers, such as the Assyrian Naqi'a or Babylonian Sammuramat and Adad-Guppi, in conjunction with the women of *DM*.[21]

The pursuit of power

In an interesting analysis of influential women, both mythical and historical, Lefkowitz argues that such women act only in times of

[19] Thargelia (below, p. 183) seems to use marriage in the same way.

[20] Presumably the two widows who commit suicide, Dido and the Egyptian Nitocris, were happily married, but they are included in *DM* by virtue of their actions as widows, not wives.

[21] For queen mothers see Seux 1980–83, 159–162; Andreasen 1983; Brosius 1996, 21–24, 198–199; cf. too below on Semiramis (p. 69), Nitocris the Babylonian (p. 108), and Lyde (p. 161).

emergency, and then return to more conventional pursuits, once the crisis is over.[22] Aretaphilia of Cyrene, described by Plutarch in his *Mulierum Virtutes* (255e–257e) is a frequently cited example of this kind of heroine.[23] Aretaphilia, we are told, frees her city from a tyrant, but despite the invitation of her fellow countrymen to participate in the government of the city, she subsequently returns home, to the women's quarters, to spend the rest of her life weaving. The biblical Judith, is another instance of a heroine of this type. Unlike the male elders of Bethuliah, Judith refuses to surrender her town to the enemy. This independent widow then uses her considerable charms in order to gain access to general Holofernes, deceive him, and decapitate him. But after a triumphant celebration with other women, Judith retires to her estate and resumes her former domestic life.[24]

The women of *DM* do not, on the whole, follow this pattern. Some of our women do come to the fore in critical times (e.g. Onomaris), but others simply come to power in the natural course of events. Once established on the throne, these women rarely relinquish their hold. Semiramis, Artemisia, and Tomyris, for example, all continue to rule even though they have grown sons who could reign in their stead. This issue of a queen competing with a mature son for control of a kingdom is one which arises in relation to historical queens of the Near East. One scholar identifies a whole series of queen consorts who are reluctant to see the reins of power handed over by their husbands to older sons, the heirs apparent. These machiavellian women do their utmost to ensure that a younger son of theirs will ascend to the throne, thus guaranteeing for themselves, the queen mothers, considerable political power and authority.[25] (On a different plane, we find the same kind of tension between a mother and her mature son in the Penelope-Telemachus relationship in the *Odyssey*.)

This brings us to the question of the relation between the women of *DM* and their immediate families. How much are these queens motivated by family ties? What is the main factor behind their actions: the desire to acquire power and succeed politically or loyalty to their men folk? Here, too, our women do not fit the model outlined by Lefkowitz, who contends that when women take political

---

[22] Lefkowitz 1986, 80–94.
[23] See e.g. Wicker 1978, 120 n. 50; Lefkowitz 1986, 88; Cantarella 1987, 57.
[24] See Judith 16: 21, 23 and cf. Levine 1995, esp. 220–223.
[25] See Ben-Barak 1987.

action they do so—at least ostensibly—on behalf of a male relative.[26] While some women in *DM* are motivated purely by family concerns—the Egyptian Nitocris avenges the death of her brother-husband, Argeia and Lyde plot for the sake of their sons—others, such as Atossa, Rhodogyne, Onomaris, and Thargelia, have no family or emotional ties as far as we can tell and seem intent on political power for its own sake. A third group of women do have male relatives, but their families do not seem to affect their actions: such are Semiramis, the Babylonian Nitocris, and Artemisia. Finally there are those women who act out of an intriguing combination of familial involvement and the pursuit or preservation of power: Zarinaea, Dido, Pheretime, and Tomyris. It is perhaps worth noting again that female relatives—mothers, daughters, and sisters—do not feature in these accounts at all and consequently have no effect on the actions of the women of *DM*.

Political skills

Another point to be considered is what makes each of these women remarkable, worthy of inclusion in *DM*. The title assigned our work in the mss., *Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare*, a title which may not stem directly from the compiler of the catalogue, ADM, is neither exact nor inclusive. It is true that the majority of our women—Semiramis, Zarinaea, Atossa, Rhodogyne, Tomyris, Artemisia, and Onomaris—are actually found on the battlefield. In addition, the Egyptian Nitocris and Pheretime are warrior-like in their vengeful deeds, the Babylonian Nitocris diverts a river to impede the approach of enemies, Thargelia assists the Persian king in enlisting allies for his military campaigns, and Dido, the founder of a colony, demonstrates great initiative and courage. But two of the 14 women, Argeia and Lyde, take no part whatsoever in military affairs and do not engage in any extraordinary activities, such as channeling rivers or founding colonies. What they do *do* is use any means available to them to assure that their sons will continue on the throne as rulers: their preoccupations and skills are political. Almost all the women of *DM* are, in fact, similarly engrossed with sovereignty and political rule, and the wars they wage are often the direct outcome of their civic concerns.

---

[26] Lefkowitz 1986, 80; cf. 1981, 8.

The women of DM *and the Amazons*

The women of *DM* are, then, outstanding either for their military prowess or their political astuteness or both. Both these areas—war and political sovereignty—are, of course, traditionally male domains and our women are noteworthy because they act (and succeed) in these alien fields. It is interesting to note in this context a complaint Strabo voices about the stories told of Amazons. These tales are incredible, he says, because they entail believing both that women can organize an army or city or tribe without men, and that they can then go on to overpower others. This, Strabo protests, is tantamount to saying that the men of that time were women and the women men (11. 5. 3).[27] The women of *DM* are neither men nor Amazons, but they are skilled in politics and war.

Why are there no Amazons, the very archetype of woman warriors, in *DM*?[28] One reason may be that the women of *DM* are allegedly historical figures, while the Amazons are not, even to Greek minds. In addition, the Amazons, unlike the women of *DM*, cannot be portrayed as victorious, because they are not allowed to defeat their Greek enemies.[29] Perhaps, too, the Amazons are considered too negative and threatening. If in early sources Amazons are seen as positive characters, a match for valiant men, they are later cast in the role of men-hating outsiders, "a golden-shielded, silver-axed, female, male-loving, male-infant-killing host."[30] Whether Amazons are meant to be figures whose way of life simply portrays the Greek world in inverse, with all their customs inverted projections of Greek mores, or they are perceived as akin to Centaurs in being outside culture altogether,[31] these warrior women are probably too extreme for ADM's purposes, whatever they may be. In fact, the Amazons are useful (here as elsewhere) in defining limits and pointing to what the women of *DM* are not. Independent though they may be, the women of *DM* are neither matriarchs nor full time

---

[27] Cf. Hardwick 1990, 21–22. The men-women statement goes back, of course, to Herodotus' Xerxes and Artemisia; see below, p. 208.

[28] On the Amazons in general see Fantham *et al.* 1994, 128–135; Hardwick 1990; Tyrrell 1984; du Bois 1982. Blok 1994 is a recent, very full treatment of early Amazons. For more on the resemblances between Amazons and the women of *DM*, see below, on Zarinaea (p. 89) and Tomyris (p. 200).

[29] Lefkowitz 1986, 19–20; Tyrrell 1984, 56.

[30] στρατὸς χρύσασπις ἀργυραξίνης θῆλυς φίλανδρος ἀρσενοβρεφοκτόνος Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F167c. Cf. Hardwick 1990; Blok 1994, esp. 276 ff.

[31] See Tyrrell 1984 and du Bois 1982 respectively.

warriors: they often marry, they acquire power from their husbands and fathers, and transmit it to their sons, and some avoid the battlefield altogether. If Amazons, on the very margins of culture, help to define "ideal" Greek women by serving as their polar opposites, the women of *DM*, a varied lot, are more difficult to categorize and pigeonhole: they do not delimit a well-defined, inverse group of "ordinary" females.

It is nonetheless an interesting exercise to arrange or assess the women of *DM* according to their similarity to Amazons, that is to say according to their independence, courage, fierceness, and resemblance to men. Argeia and Lyde, who do not rule independently and act only on behalf of their sons, would be at one end of such a scale, while women such as Onomaris, Atossa, and Tomyris would be at the other end. The warrior queen Rhodogyne, who is said to be interested in killing men, not in loving them, is perhaps the closest to the man-hating Amazon stereotype. Nonetheless, as her half-braided, half-disarrayed hair vividly demonstrates, Rhodogyne belongs to the civilized world as well. Lyde is a particularly interesting figure because she seems to succeed solely by virtue of gentle qualities, more readily associated with women: she is wise, kind, and conciliatory. Other women, such as Thargelia and Zarinaea, use techniques often attributed to women, for they are seductive figures, who make full use of their physical charms. It is worth noting that ADM never once refers to the physical appearance of the women he describes, even though several of the women are termed beautiful by their original authors. We shall see that in most catalogues of women, from Homer and Hesiod onwards, beauty is an outstanding attribute of the women included.

War, Weaving, and Wiles: Gender Roles

The series of women presented in *DM*, taken together, is clearly intended to indicate to the reader something about women's roles and capabilities. While individual stories may have been narrated by their original authors for a variety of reasons—emphasizing, for example, the weakness of the Persian king, rather than celebrating the strength of his female opponent—[32] the collection as a whole

---

[32] See above, n. 13 and cf. Brosius 1996, 105–122, 195–198.

points to the power of women. Thus the very compilation of such an anthology, the act of collecting the tales of these extraordinary women and presenting them to the reader, is in essence a statement on gender roles. But the statement is a limited and indirect one: while we are meant to notice the unusual range of activities undertaken by the women of *DM*, we do not know if we are supposed to find these women paradoxical or praiseworthy, admirable or amazing. Since *DM* is a collection based on portraits of women found in earlier writings, and ADM (on the whole) simply summarizes his sources selectively, but includes no additional editorial comment of his own, we might expect to find in the work further, more direct reflections on gender roles only if they are found in the original sources. Most of ADM's sources are historical, and the women are presented in these original compositions as figures who play a role in their country's history, not as unusual women *per se*. Aeschines the Socratic is the only one of our original authors who was not a historian, and it is likely that the philosopher *was* interested in Thargelia and Rhodogyne from the first as unusual figures who could illustrate the truth of more theoretical propositions on the nature of women.[33] Unfortunately ADM includes no such reflections from Aeschines. There are, in fact, only two places in our collection where ADM specifically refers to women as women, i.e. explicitly takes their gender into account. In the first instance, he tells us that Atossa, the daughter trained to take her father's place as ruler of Persia, was raised as a male. She hides her feminine mentality (ἐπίνοιαν), ADM—or his source, Hellanicus—tells us, and immediately adds that she wears a tiara and trousers, uses eunuchs, and communicates by writing. In other words, Atossa tries to efface her identity as a woman by hiding her physical presence behind a wall of eunuchs, indirect communication, and unrevealing clothing. The second reference to gender roles is found in the notice on Artemisia. This notice is supposedly based on Herodotus, but ADM includes a picturesque detail which is not found in the Halicarnassian's history.[34] Xerxes thinks that the men in his army have behaved like women at the battle of Salamis, and the women (or to be more accurate, one woman, Artemisia) like men. Consequently, ADM—but not Herodotus—adds,

[33] For the role played by Thargelia and Rhodogyne in Aeschines' *Aspasia*, see below, p. 180.

[34] See on Artemisia, p. 211.

the Persian king presents Artemisia with a suit of armor, while the cowardly Phoenicians are given spindles and distaffs. These gifts, the notice continues, underline the reversal of gender roles: the queen is rewarded for her manly courage and the Phoenicians are humiliated by gifts associated with womanly pursuits.

Weaving

The contrast found here between war and weaving, men's work and women's work, goes all the way back to Homer. Weaving or woolworking was the quintessential activity of women of the ancient world.[35] In Homer, Penelope, Circe, Helen, Andromache, and Arete all weave, as do women of lower rank.[36] But already in Homer, weaving often implies more than simply making a garment. Skill in weaving is the gift of Athena and the goddess grants wise or subtle thoughts along with the knowledge of fine works (*Od.* 2. 116–118; cf. 7. 108–111).[37] This link between weaving and subtle thoughts is first found in the course of a description of the web woven by Penelope, a shroud she weaves during the day and then unravels at night to delay her suitors. Penelope the weaver is inventive and cunning[38] and the act of weaving itself both represents the chief activity of women at home and symbolizes a female kind of intelligence—crafty, subtle, and, at times, deceitful.[39] If weaving is the foremost province of women, war is normally the exclusive prerogative of men, and the two are contrasted time and again. Thus Helen weaves a web which depicts the battles fought because of her at Troy (*Il.* 3. 125–128). In the famous farewell scene between Hector and Andromache in the *Iliad*, Hector urges his wife to return home, to her loom and distaff; war, he adds, is the concern of men (*Il.* 6. 490–493; cf. 7. 236).[40] (Ironically, per-

---

[35] See e.g. Arthur 1973, 13; Fantham *et al.* 1994, 103–104; Barber 1994 *passim.*

[36] See S. West in Heubeck *et al.* 1988 ad *Od.* 1. 356–358; Barber 1994, 226–231.

[37] See Detienne and Vernant 1978, 239–40; cf. 185–186 n. 33.

[38] See e.g. Thornton 1970, 94–96; Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994, esp. 20–23, 41–48.

[39] Keuls 1993, 232–235, 244–260 discusses the sexual and cultural implications of weaving and analyzes vases depicting woolworking. She points out that woven garments feature heavily in myths of female rebellion, as in the tales of Clytemnestra, Medea, Deianeira, and Arachne; see too Barker 1994, 232–244.

[40] See the variations at *Od.* 1. 356–359 and 21. 350–353: speech and the bow are the concern of men. For an analysis of gender roles in the Hector-Andromache scene, see Arthur 1981 and Cantarella 1987, 192 n. 8.

haps, Andromache will be at her loom when the news of Hector's death reaches her and the shuttle will drop from her hand—*Il.* 22. 440–448). Socrates points out to Alcibiades that women understand the spinning of wool while men know about arms (Pl. *Alc.* I 126e–127a; cf. *Rep.* 455c) and there are many other such passages. In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, this demarcation of roles is rejected: Lysistrata is tired of being told that war is the concern of men and states flatly that it is a woman's affair (520, 538). At the same time she dresses the *proboulos* like a wife and teaches him to work wool, explaining how Athens' affairs can be untangled like a ball of wool (567 ff.). In the *Birds* (829–831) we again find these traditional activities reversed: Euelpides protests that Athena, a female god (θεὸς γυνή) guards the city in her suit of armor (πανοπλία), while the effeminate Cleisthenes has a weaver's shuttle.[41] Athena ἐργάνη, patron goddess of weaving, is, of course, equally at home in panoply or at the loom. In Diodorus (3. 53) the Amazon *men* of Libya stay home, weave, and tend the children; they are not allowed to govern. This is reminiscent of Herodotus' topsy turvy Egypt where men stay at home and weave while women do the marketing and selling; similarly, Sophocles' Oedipus has the Egyptian women out of doors providing food.[42] In these last two examples the gender roles are still reversed, and men continue to weave, but the women have moved on to other masculine functions. It is instructive to see what, in addition to war, is contrasted with weaving in Greek sources, for this is a shorthand method of defining unwomanly occupations. Thus Pindar's Cyrene dislikes the loom and prefers to slay wild beasts with spears and sword (*Pyth.* 9. 19–22) and Euripides' Agaue feels that by leaving her looms and shuttles behind she has come to something much greater—hunting with her bare hands (*Bacchae* 1236). The Bacchants have also left their looms to go off to the mountains because they are stung to madness by Dionysus (*Ba.* 118). In later sources we find weaving contrasted with learning: Hipparchia has abandoned her woolworking for the study of philosophy (Diog. Laert. 6. 96–98).[43]

---

[41] Sommerstein 1987, ad loc. notes that this passage in Aristophanes is a parody of Euripides *Meleager* fr. 522 : "... if work with shuttles were to be the concern of men, while women were seized with the delights of weaponry ..."

[42] Hdt. 2. 35; *OC* 339–341; cf. *Dissoi Logoi* (DK 90) 2. 17.

[43] Compare Musonius Rufus at Stob. 2. 31. 126.

Deceptions

None of the women of *DM* are actually found working wool, although we might imagine a figure like Lyde sitting at her loom, but almost all do weave wiles. The majority use deceptions of one kind or another: Semiramis, Artemisia, the two Nitocrises, Argeia, Dido, Atossa, Lyde, and (possibly) Pheretime all use various tricks, stratagems and ploys. Such deceptions are in a sense woman's weapons, where guile replaces the open exercise of physical force.[44] The very fact that many of the women of *DM* survive their husbands can be seen as a covert kind of craftiness or defiance: by outliving their men folk, these widows outwit them in a way, acquiring a great deal of freedom and power.[45] Several of the women use both male and female weapons, i.e. both take to the battlefield and make use of deceptions, and we can distinguish between womanly stratagems and the more masculine kind. Semiramis who constructs huge dummy elephants to confuse the enemy is using a conventional stratagem favored by men, and the channel of water used by the Egyptian Nitocris is a similarly "masculine" ploy. But most of the women of *DM* use words, as with Argeia's claim of ignorance or the Babylonian Nitocris' deceptive epitaph. Other women direct their cunning against themselves: Lyde fasts, Atossa conceals her identity, Dido commits suicide. The most interesting and unconventional ploy is that used by Artemisia: when she blithely sinks her ally's ship, she appears to be mocking the very institution of war.

Deceptive though they may be, the women of *DM* exhibit their intelligence in ways other than the use of stratagems and wiles. Artemisia and Tomyris offer Persian kings wise advice (which is not heeded), and Atossa introduces a series of innovations to ensure her subjects' obedience. The Babylonian Nitocris is said to be more clever than Semiramis and Lyde is wise in the ways of her son's heart. Zarinaea and Thargelia are also singled out for their intelligence.

Intelligent women

We are plainly meant to notice the cleverness of the women of *DM* and such an attitude towards wisdom in women is unusual. Greek

---

[44] See Buxton 1994, 122–127.
[45] See Buitelaar 1995, 11.

women were not normally considered clever and a display of intelligence by women often caused difficulties. A series of figures in Euripides' plays conveniently illustrate various popular attitudes towards the mental capacities of women.[46] Theseus graciously allows his mother to speak up, because many wise things also come from women (*Supp.* 293–294), but when Electra comes up with a good idea, Orestes attributes it to the male mind found in her female body (*Or.* 1204–1205). Hippolytus, in his notorious tirade against women, blames stupid women for being useless, but nonetheless prefers them to intelligent ones, who are dangerous (*Hipp.* 638–644). Medea speaks passionately of the suspicion she encounters because she is clever (*Med.* 292 ff.), while Andromache is upbraided for parading her intelligence in front of men (*Andr.* 364–5).

Intelligence in a woman is then, according to popular belief, surprising and disturbing. Two heroines in Aristophanes, Lysistrata and Praxagora, are conspicuous for their intellectual acumen, but they are careful to explain how they came by their abilities. Lysistrata, when trying to arrange the peace between Athenians and Spartans, reassures her male audience that she is both intelligent in her own right and has listened to the talk of her father and other older men (*Lys.* 1124–1127).[47] Praxagora, questioned by her admiring female listeners, explains that she has learned to speak by listening to—and learning—the speeches of the orators in the Pnyx (*Eccl.* 241–245). Despite their education, Lysistrata and Praxagora must use devious means before they are allowed to present their ideas in public, and their ideas—on the very unwomanly topics of war and the administration of the polis—are, of course, quite revolutionary. Both these heroines assimilate themselves to men: Lysistrata, termed ἀνδρειοτάτη is a combination of formidable and gentle, haughty and tender qualities (*Lys.* 1108–1109). She is an Athena-like, androgynous figure with both male and female traits.[48] We have already seen that she declares that war is the concern of women, not just men, and explains to the *proboulos* how the city's affairs can be untangled like a skein of wool (above, p. 21). Praxagora, no less an impressive figure, is termed a general (ἡ στρατηγός *Eccl.* 246, 491 etc.), although her wars are

[46] See e.g. Dover 1974, 98–101 for further discussion and references.

[47] Henderson 1987, 197 points out that Melanippe the Wise whom Lysistrata quotes here (ἐγὼ γυνὴ μέν εἰμι, νοῦς δ' ἔνεστί μοι *Lys.* 1124), was taught by her *mother* (Eur. frr. 483–484 N.).

[48] Henderson 1987, xxxvii–xxxviii; Taaffe 1993, 61–66.

waged in the Assembly, not on the battlefield. Dressed in her husband's clothes,[49] she addresses the Assembly and suggests that the city be handed over to women (427 ff.). Women will take over as magistrates, abolish private property and private families (583 ff.).[50] They will not, however, serve in the army (233–235) and they will continue to act as stewards and treasurers at home as well as in the polis (210–212, 597–600).

Aristophanes' two heroines, who are eager to govern the polis and conduct war policy, remind us of the women of *DM*. The two plays furnish important evidence for contemporary speculation in Athens about the nature and role of women. Unconventional ideas about the capacities of women were frequently associated with the names of Euripides and Socrates, and members of the Socratic circle such as Aeschines and Antisthenes.[51] (The outstanding source for innovative ideas on the capabilities and position of women is, of course, Book 5 of Plato's *Republic*, to which we will turn immediately below.) We must remember, however, that the *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae* are *comedies* about women invading the traditionally male domains of war and politics, and the reversal of gender roles found in the plays is meant, above all, to be amusing.[52]

Women at war

Even in the fantasy worlds found in these two plays, Aristophanes' women do not take to the battlefield[53] and it is this aspect of the women of *DM*—their success as warriors—which is most unusual.[54]

---

[49] Compare Atossa of *DM* and cf. Taaffe 1993, 110: "... the acquisition of power in Athens seems to be related to the appearance of masculinity."

[50] Such communism is, of course, reminiscent of Plato's ideal city in the *Republic*; for the relation between the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Republic* Book 5 see e.g. Halliwell 1993, 224–225.

[51] See Halliwell 1993, 9–12, 31–32 for a useful summary of ideas about women that were "in the air" in late 5th and early 4th century Athens; see too Fantham *et al.* 1994, 118–124; Cantarella 1987, 52–62. Vogt 1960 is a balanced survey of Greek pronouncements on equality of the sexes, and Halperin 1990, 113–151, 190–211 is a provocative discussion with extensive bibliography,

[52] There were, it seems, several other comedies dealing with women in charge: plays called Γυναικοκρατία by Alexis (*PCG* ii frr. 42–43) and by Amphis (*PCG* ii fr. 8); a Τυραννίς by Pherecrates (*PCG* vii frr. 150–154); and a Στρατιώτιδες by Theopompus (*PCG* vii frr. 55–59).

[53] See however the armed women of *Lys.* 452 ff.

[54] See e.g. F. Graf 1984, esp. 245. Schaps 1982 is a survey of allegedly historical incidents involving Greek women in wartime.

We have already seen that war was traditionally the concern of men, as opposed to women's woolworking. Women were not, of course, normally expected to fight: when the women of Corcyra stand their ground and throw tiles from the rooftops on the attacking enemy, Thucydides says that they are acting παρὰ φύσιν "against"—or perhaps "beyond"—"their nature" (Thuc. 3. 74. 1; cf. 2. 4. 2).[55] Lysias (2. 4) states that the Amazons were considered men because of their courage, despite their womanly form. It was the gravest of insults for a Greek to be told that he was unmanly or fought like a woman, but even worse was to be bested by a woman in battle.[56]

Women, too, could be accused of cowardice. In Aeschylus' *Septem* (181–202), Eteocles reproaches the women of Thebes for appealing to the statues of the gods when the Argives are about to attack: he finds bold women unendurable and fearful women useless. Aristotle (*Politics* 1269b30 ff.) accuses the overly-independent women of Sparta of causing more confusion than the enemy when their country was invaded, and Plato is similarly negative about the fighting abilities of the Spartan women of his time (*Laws* 806b). But Plato does not think women incapable of bravery: indeed Book 5 of the *Republic* is the outstanding discussion of the proposition that women are capable of participating in government and war.

Plato's female guardians

When outlining his ideal city in the *Republic*, Plato proposes that there be female as well as male Guardians. These women are to guard the city, govern it, and defend it in war. The female guardians will be trained along with their male counterparts in gymnastics and music, and will actually take part in battles (*Rep.* 451b–457c). Some women may even attain to the highest status of all in Plato's state, that of philosopher-rulers (473c; cf. 460b). Plato bases his suggestion to include women as Guardians on the argument that the nature of women is not inferior to that of men. Women are different biologically from men, but that is irrelevant to their function as Guardians, just as it

[55] Two recent interpreters understand παρὰ φύσιν in quite different ways. Harvey 1985, 83 thinks that the phrase indicates "guarded admiration" on the part of the historian while Wiedemann 1983, 169 argues that the women's behavior is, in Thucydides' eyes, "not appropriate . . . unnatural". These divergent interpretations summarize in a nutshell two possible reactions to the women of *DM*.

[56] See the references in Dover 1974, 100–101 and below on Artemisia (p. 209).

does not matter, professionally speaking, if a cobbler is bald. Individual women have individual natures and abilities, and consequently certain women can be superior to men, even in such areas as warfare and philosophy, Socrates and Glaucon conclude (454b–457b).[57] This last point—on the existence of individual superior women who may well excel as philosopher-rulers or warriors—is particularly interesting for our purposes, for one way to bolster Plato's arguments here is to adduce actual instances of women who did in fact succeed as rulers or on the battlefield. Indeed, this is just what the nineteenth century scholar Grote does in his commentary on this section of the *Republic.* Grote tries to strengthen Plato's argument by introducing historical women who exemplify intelligence and courage; he regrets that Plato seems to have been unacquainted with the exploits of Artemisia, one of the women of *DM.*[58] Almost all of the women of *DM* could, in fact, serve as such examples to support Plato's views.[59] Plato himself is not unaware of the value of *exempla* as we learn from his arguments in the *Laws* (804d–806c, 813c–814c). In the less radical—but nonetheless ideal—state of the *Laws*, women are still to be educated and trained to fight, and the Athenian Stranger states that certain ancient stories persuaded him that this was a good idea. Subsequently he will specifically mention both the Amazons and contemporary Sauromatae women as proof that women can be skilled in riding horses and using weapons (*Laws* 804e–805a, 806b).[60] In sum, Plato overrules traditional gender roles and allows that women may be intelligent, successful rulers, and skillful warriors and it is precisely in these three areas that the women of *DM* excel.

The Form, Sources, and Structure of *DM*

DM, a series of brief portraits based on the writings of others, is a sub-literary text, not a literary work, and the style is plain, condensed, and unadorned. There are 14 notices, all of them quite brief. All the notices have several elements in common, but the presentation or

[57] Cf. Annas 1981, 181–185 and Halliwell 1993, 146–155 for good analyses of Plato's argument here. Bluestone 1987 surveys scholarship of the past hundred years on the question of Plato's feminism.

[58] Grote 1888, 196–197.

[59] Cf. below, p. 60.

[60] Cf. Halliwell 1993, 10–11. For the Sauromatae see below on Zarinaea (p. 90).

order of these basic building blocks is varied slightly from one item to the next. Thus each notice opens with the heroine's name, but in some accounts the woman's bare name is recorded (e.g. Semiramis, Zarinaea), while in others her nationality, the country over which she rules, or the name of a male relative is appended to her name (e.g. Rhodogyne, Artemisia). This introductory mention of the woman's name generally serves as a simple heading, but in some notices the name is woven syntactically into the first sentence of the text and opens the actual narrative (e.g. Egyptian Nitocris, Rhodogyne).[61] The second sentence of a notice often contains a mention of ADM's source, but here too we find several variations. The original author may be mentioned only at the very end of the notice and some writers are quoted with φησί, some with ἱστορεῖ and there is sometimes a second φησί later on in the account; see the sources table below (p. 28). Some of the notices are presented entirely or mainly in *oratio obliqua*, while others are in direct speech. This combination of a fixed pattern with slight variations in the individual notices is typical of catalogue writing and we shall find it in the earliest catalogues of women from Homer onwards.

Language and style

The sentence structure of the notices in *DM* is very simple. ADM uses few subordinate clauses and many participles, generally aorist participles, which are often in the genitive absolute. Most of the finite verbs are in the aorist as well. There are no instances of the subjunctive, and only one optative which is found in the sole conditional clause of *DM*.[62] Sentences are generally linked by δέ and clauses by καί; μὲν ... δὲ ... is less frequent. There are few inferential particles or connectives—two instances of γάρ, one instance each of μέντοι, διό, ὅθεν, and ἐπεί—and few relative pronouns. The style is that of a summary or a brief encyclopedic notice and reminiscent of e.g. the epitome of [Apollodorus] *Bibliotheca*. One late feature of *DM*, often found in post-classical texts, is the use of μή to negate all participles and infinitives. The frequent use of αὕτη or αὐτή at the beginning of new sentences is also noteworthy. Some of the

[61] Cf. Geiger 1985, 41.
[62] See below on Tomyris, p. 204.

vocabulary is late, e.g. βασίλισσα, rather than βασίλεια,[63] and Herodotus' Ionic forms and vocabulary are generally altered.[64]

On the whole, ADM presents his material in spare, unemotional fashion. He rarely adds color or embroiders on his original sources. Indeed the brisk, brief format of the notices tend, if anything, to flatten his material and make it seem less picturesque than it actually is.

The sources of DM

The question of the sources utilized by ADM is an important one. The following table summarizes the source and means of citation for each notice.

Woman	*Source*	*How Cited*
Semiramis	Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F1c	ὥς φησι Κτησίας
Zarinaea	Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F7	ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κτησίας
Nitocris Egypt.	Herodotus 2. 100	περὶ ἧς Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ
Nitocris Bab.	Herodotus 1. 185–187	ταύτην φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος . . . φησι . . .
Argeia	Herodotus 6. 52	ταύτην φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος
Dido	Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F82	ταύτην φησὶ Τίμαιος . . . φησι . . .
Atossa	Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F178a	ταύτην φησὶν Ἑλλάνικος
Rhodogyne	Aeschines fr. 18 Dittmar	ὥς φησιν Αἰσχίνης ὁ φιλόσοφος . . . φησιν . . .
Lyde	Xenophilus *FGrH* 767 F1	ταύτην φησὶν Ξενόφιλος ὁ τὰς Λυδικὰς ἱστορίας γράψας . . . φησι . . .
Pheretime	Menecles *FGrH* 270 F5	καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Μενεκλῆς ὁ τὰς Λιβυκὰς ἱστορίας γράψας
Thargelia	[Aeschines fr. 21 Dittmar] [Hippias *FGrH* 6 F3]	ταύτην φασὶν . . .
Tomyris	Herodotus 1. 204–216	καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Ἡρόδοτος
Artemisia	Herodotus 7. 99; 8. 68, 87–88, 93, 101–102	ὥς φησιν Ἡρόδοτος . . . φησι . . .
Onomaris	??	–

[63] Buck 1914 points out that Xenophon is the earliest attested writer to use βασίλισσα and may have coined the word. Carney 1991 notes that the term was not used as a title for royal women until after the death of Alexander.

[64] See below on Artemisia, p. 211 and Tomyris, p. 204.

ADM mentions seven authors: Herodotus supplies information for 5 of the women, Ctesias for two, while Hellanicus, Xenophilus, Aeschines, Timaeus, and Menecles are each the source of one notice. Two accounts, those of Thargelia and Onomaris, are not assigned to any one writer. Thargelia's notice is particularly interesting for ADM simply notes "they say" (φασί) instead of naming any one author. While it is generally agreed that Aeschines the Socratic was his source, we know that another early writer, the sophist Hippias, also described Thargelia[65] and the plural φασί may indicate that ADM was aware of both their works. The notice dealing with Onomaris is much more difficult to assign. Since it is the last item in our brief work, it is possible that a source citation which appeared at the very end of the notice (as with e.g. Zarinaea and Pheretime) has fallen out at some stage, but there may be other reasons for the omission.[66]

ADM presents his authors in different ways. Herodotus, Ctesias, Timaeus, and Hellanicus need no further identification. Aeschines is called the philosopher, presumably in order to distinguish him from the orator. The obscure Xenophilus and Menecles have to be identified as the authors of works on Lydia and Libya respectively. In other words, our anonymous author includes just the identification and detail that a modern reader would need.

Dating DM

The date of the latest of these authors would, of course, give us a *terminus post quem* for the compilation of *DM*. Herodotus and Hellanicus, fifth-century BC historians, are the earliest of the authors to be cited, while Ctesias, Aeschines, and Timaeus belong to the fourth and/or third centuries. The two crucial dates are those of Menecles and Xenophilus, but we cannot assign a definite time to either of these two historians. Menecles is generally dated to the time of Ptolemy Physcon, i.e. middle or late second century BC, but could be later, i.e. first century BC.[67] Our notice is the sole surviving fragment of the obscure Xenophilus who was in all likelihood a historian of the

[65] Hippias told of Thargelia in his Συναγωγή or *Collection*, an anthology of some kind. Müller *FHG* ii, 60 suggests that the *Synagoge* dealt with illustrious women, chiefly, it seems, because the notice on Thargelia is the only clue we have to its contents. See below, on Thargelia, p. 180.

[66] See on Onomaris, p. 220.

[67] Fraser 1972 i, 517–518; see on Pheretime, p. 164.

Hellenistic era. Xenophilus' work was, it seems, used by Nicolaus of Damascus, which would mean that he was no later than the first century BC.[68] In other words, *DM* was probably compiled at the very earliest at the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century BC.

Order and scope of the notices

The notices are not arranged in any discernible order: the women are not presented chronologically or alphabetically. While the first notices seem to be arranged according to the source cited—2 from Ctesias, 3 from Herodotus, 1 each from Timaeus, Hellanicus, Aeschines, Xenophilus, and Menecles—Herodotus then appears again as the source of two further notices. The order of items in catalogues is often fairly random and there is no reason why this should not be true of *DM* as well. Plutarch, before describing the individual heroines of his catalogue of outstanding women, the *Mulierum Virtutes*, states that he will present these women as they come to him, at random (ὅπως ἂν ἐπίῃ, σποράδην 253f), because he does not think that his inquiry requires a chronological arrangement. Plutarch is, of course, correct: it is the variety, quality, and sheer weight of examples that is important in lists of this kind, not the order of the individual items. Since *DM* is simply a catalogue with no preface or conclusion, and the women are not presented in any particular order, it is impossible to know whether we possess *DM* in its entirety and it may originally have been a longer work which did not end after Onomaris, the fourteenth woman.

Another point to be noted is that while the notices in *DM* are all more or less the same length, the accounts of the women found in ADM's original sources were of widely differing lengths. It is only in the case of Herodotus and (to a certain extent) Ctesias that we are able to compare the scope of the original tales of these heroines with their summary in *DM*. In some instances, e.g. Argeia or the Egyptian Nitocris, the original source is not much longer than the subsequent notice, and it is barely necessary for our anonymous author to summarize the text. In other cases, such as that of Artemisia or

[68] Jacoby (in the margins of the text of *FGrH* 767 F1) simply writes Hellenistic with a question mark; cf. Regenbogen 1943, 23–24 and see on Lyde, p. 159.

Tomyris, the account of the woman in the original source is considerably longer and scattered over several sections of the work so that producing a précis involves more effort. Ctesias' account of Semiramis filled, it seems, nearly two books of his *Persica* and our brief notice may represent a serious exercise in epitome. The information given in the notices of *DM* range from a full-fledged, if brief, biography (e.g. Semiramis), through a survey of the main points of the queen's career (e.g. Dido, Pheretime), to a description of a single incident in the life of the heroine (e.g. Argeia, Nitocris the Egyptian, Rhodogyne). It seems clear that our anonymous author is often at the mercy of his sources here. If the notice on Semiramis is closest to a real biography—and includes a description of her origins, marriages, children, achievements, and the number of years she lived and ruled—this is, in all likelihood, because ADM had the fullest information for her. Similarly, if all we hear about the Egyptian Nitocris is her act of vengeance against her brother's murderers, that is simply the extent of the information to be found in ADM's source, Herodotus.

Did our author consult the sources he cites firsthand? Does he summarize these sources accurately? We are best able to judge in the case of Herodotus, the only authority whose work survives in its entirety, but a comparison between *DM* and the Halicarnassian's original work does not provide us with an unequivocal answer. The notices in *DM* which are based on Herodotus are—except in the case of Artemisia—fairly accurate and comprehensive, and even contain verbal echoes of the *History*.[69] But since Artemisia's entry in *DM* contains information which is not in Herodotus, we cannot simply assume that ADM summarized the remaining, non-extant authors either competently or directly.[70] On the whole, though, we shall see that the notices in *DM* seem to be accurate and based on the authorities cited by our anonymous author, so that it seems best to assume that ADM did read his sources, but was occasionally careless.

---

[69] See on the two Nitocrises (p. 103 and 118), Tomyris (p. 204), Argeia (p. 122), and Artemisia (p. 211). There appears to be an echo of Aeschines' original wording in the Thargelia notice—cf. p. 180.

[70] Cf. too the telltale use of the word προειρημένα "aforementioned" in the notice on Rhodogyne (p. 153).

The Genre of *DM*

DM can be viewed in several ways—as an assemblage of brief biographical anecdotes, a collection telling of unusual figures, a series of *exempla* or παραδείγματα, i.e. "memorable precedents to be quoted or copied when occasion arises,"[71] a collection of stratagems, or a catalogue of women—and all these types of anthologies, except for the last, point to the Hellenistic origins of our work.[72] Before we turn to Hellenistic writings, it is worth remembering that a very early anthology, Hippias' Συναγωγή, already included a brief item on one of the women of *DM*.[73]

Works on notable personalities

The fourth century BC historian Theopompus apparently paved the way for the brief biographical works associated with the Peripatetics.[74] His wide-ranging history of Philip II of Macedon, the *Philippica*, included two digressions filled with biographical detail: one on Athenian demagogues (*FGrH* 115 F85–100) and another on marvels, miracles, and the prophets and mystics associated with them (F64–77).[75] This second collection, known as the Marvels (θαυμάσια) because of the wonders it describes, seems particularly relevant to *DM*, because it tells of a series of (historical) figures who share certain specific but unusual characteristics.

In the fourth and third centuries, several Peripatetic authors produced collections telling of narrowly defined groups of unusual people, in addition to more general works on lawgivers, poets, philosophers etc.[76] The third century pupil of Callimachus, Hermippus of Smyrna,

---

[71] Momigliano 1971, 72. For a good, brief discussion of *exempla* literature, see Lord 1969, 22–25 and see the further references in Geiger 1985, 73 n. 38.

[72] Momigliano 1971, 72–73; Fraser 1972 i, 452–455.

[73] See n. 65 above.

[74] Since *DM* is clearly not a series of biographies *per se*, there is no need to enter here into the question of the origins of literary and political biographies or the different approaches, Peripatetic and Alexandrian, purportedly used in writing biographies. See Momigliano 1971, esp. 8–22, 65–82 for a discussion of the Peripatetics and biography; Geiger 1985, 30–65 discusses the evidence for political biography in the Hellenistic age.

[75] Momigliano 1971, 63; Connor 1968, 70 calls these digressions in Theopompus "embryonic biographies."

[76] The index at the end of the tenth volume of Wehrli (1959, 175–180) conveniently lists the writings of the Peripatetics.

wrote for instance a work entitled *On Those who Passed from Philosophy to Tyranny and Despotic Rule* (περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς τυραννίδας καὶ δυναστείας μεθεστηκότων frr. 89–91 Wehrli) and may have written another composition on slaves who were distinguished in philosophy. Women *Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare* certainly sounds like a work of similar genre. Earlier, Phaenias (or Phanias) of Eresus, a pupil of Aristotle, wrote of tyrants who were killed in revenge (τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας frr. 14–16 Wehrli). While the work may have been intended to follow up Aristotle's series of such tyrants in the *Politics* (1311a36 ff.), Wehrli thinks that it was a collection of independent novellas, the presentation of which had little to do with political theory.[77] This would mean that a work of political thought gave rise to a collection of curious anecdotes, which somehow illustrated or bolstered the theoretical argument, but were mainly told for their own sake. Could this be the rationale behind our collection? Was our catalogue of intelligent and warlike women rulers prompted, for example, by the discussion of the female Guardians in Book 5 of Plato's *Republic*? I shall return to these questions below.

Collections telling of women

More generally, there were collections telling of notable or illustrious personalities. Neanthes of Cyzicus (of the 3rd century BC) seems to have been the first to write περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν "About Illustrious Men," a series of short biographies or anecdotes.[78] Normally these collections described *men*, but a certain Charon of Carthage is said to have composed two parallel collections, each 4 books long, on illustrious men and illustrious women (βίους ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν ἐν βιβλίοις δ′, βίους γυναικῶν ὁμοίως ἐν δ′ Suda s.v. Χάρων). We know nothing of Charon's date or the content of these parallel works, and scholars find it difficult to imagine what sort of women actually filled the pages of these four volumes.[79] But the very fact that Charon chose to write parallel works is interesting and perhaps he matched the women with the men in some way.

Photius (codex 161) supplies us with more information on lost collections telling of notable women. An obscure 4th century AD

[77] Wehrli 1957, 32.
[78] *FGrH* 84 F13; cf. Momigliano 1971, 71.
[79] See Geiger 1985, 39–40; Stadter 1965, 8.

sophist, Sopatros,[80] compiled twelve books of miscellaneous extracts. One book included extracts from a work which told of the courageous (or virtuous) exploits of women (τῶν κατ' ἀρετὴν γυναιξὶ πεπραγματευμένων διηγημάτων 103a) by Artemon of Magnesia, an author unknown to us. In another book, Sopatros made use of an early, anonymous catalogue telling of women "who achieved a distinguished name and great glory" (τὰς εἰς μέγα δόξης καὶ ὄνομα λαμπρὸν ἀρθείσας γυναῖκας καταλέγει 104a), and in a third volume he excerpted the work of a 1st century BC writer, Apollonius the Stoic, on the subject of "women who were philosophers or achieved some other distinction or through whose influence families were reconciled" (ὅσαι γυναῖκες ἐφιλοσόφησαν ἢ καὶ ἄλλως τι ἐπίδοξον διεπράξαντο, καὶ δι' ἃς οἰκίαι εἰς εὔνοιαν συνεκράθησαν 104b). While the last composition clearly cannot be a description of *DM* for none of our women is a philosopher, the first two works excerpted by Sopatros sound very much like our composition. Nonetheless, it is not really helpful to try to identify *DM* with either of these two collections;[81] at best we will replace ADM with another anonymous author or the unknown, but named, Artemon of Magnesia. Yet Photius' description of the 12 books of Sopatros is interesting for the light it casts on the variety of works dealing with women. We hear that the sophist's compilation included—in addition to the three anthologies already mentioned—accounts of female dancers and actresses (Book 5), flute players and prophetesses (Book 6), besides telling of such male figures. There was, apparently, a great deal written about women of all kinds by the time Sopatros compiled his collection.[82]

Plutarch's Mulierum Virtutes

We have already encountered an earlier compilation which bears an affinity to *DM*, Plutarch's tales of virtuous women, *Mulierum Virtutes*. In the introduction to his collection Plutarch hints at the popularity of compositions dealing with his subject, the notable deeds of women, and states that he will try to avoid retelling well-known, hackneyed stories (τὰ ... ἄγαν περιβόητα ... τὰ κοινὰ καὶ δεδημευμένα *Mor.* 243d)

---

[80] Cf. Wilson 1994, 143.

[81] Stadter 1965, 8 with n. 40 surveys such attempts.

[82] See e.g. Gronewald 1979 on a papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 441 = Pack² 1995) which has anecdotes of noteworthy women.

and present less familiar tales. This statement by Plutarch indicates that there was a corpus of collections or catalogues telling of brave and unusual women before the *Mulierum Virtutes* was written, i.e. before 115–125 AD.[83] As Fraser notes, it is characteristic of such collections to use the same sources, either independently or at second hand, and repeat the same stories, time and again.[84] In other words, once women such as Tomyris, Artemisia, or Dido entered catalogues of notable women, they were not rapidly displaced. Thus the fact that not even one of the women of *DM* is found in Plutarch's composition, taken together with his statement that he deliberately omits well-known heroines, makes it likely that Plutarch was acquainted with an earlier anthology similar to our own.[85] This is not to say that Plutarch had our text of *DM* in front of him—indeed we cannot be absolutely certain that *DM* was compiled before Plutarch's work—but he may well have been familiar with a variation on our composition, another, perhaps longer and fuller catalogue which included many of our heroines and used the same sources.[86] It is worth noting that in his introduction Plutarch *mentions* Semiramis, one of the women of *DM* and a popular figure in catalogues of this kind down to medieval times, citing her as an example of an outstanding woman (*Mor.* 243c), but he does not include an actual portrait of the warrior queen.

Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes* differs from *DM* in ways other than the choice of heroines. Unlike ADM, Plutarch includes an introduction to his catalogue, explaining that his purpose in recounting these tales is to demonstrate that the virtue of men and women is one and the same: his historical *exempla* are, in essence, arguments meant to prove a thesis.[87] (It should be noted parenthetically that this identical virtue is men's virtue. While Plutarch demonstrates that women can

[83] Stadter 1965, 2–3 discusses the dating of the *Mulierum Virtutes*.

[84] Fraser 1972 i, 454–455; he refers to paradoxographical texts. See too Lord 1969, 22–25.

[85] See Stadter 1965, 8 and compare 126. Even if Stadter is correct in claiming that Plutarch did not use any such anthology when compiling the *Mulierum Virtutes*, this does not mean that there were no such collections. It is much more likely that the narrators of well-known stories referred to at *Mor.* 243d are compilers of such anthologies and not individual historians.

[86] The emperor Julian (*Or.* 3. 127a–c) seems to have been acquainted with such a *DM*-related catalogue, for in a brief list of warlike women, he mentions four figures found in our work—Semiramis, Nitocris, Rhodogyne, and Tomyris—and precisely in the sequence in which they are found in *DM*.

[87] McLeod 1991, 20; Stadter 1965, 10–11.

perform manly deeds, he certainly is not interested in the reverse side of the coin, i.e. showing that men have characteristics traditionally considered feminine. He also takes the existence of courageous or virtuous men for granted and adduces no actual instances of such parallel men, outside of his introduction.)[88] In the *Mulierum Virtutes*, Plutarch includes stories of groups of women (nos. 1–15), in addition to reports of individual heroines (nos. 16–27) such as we find in *DM*.[89] His accounts are considerably longer than the brief notices of *DM* and the range of heroines is much wider: Plutarch includes not just queens, but female poets, prophets, judges, and priestesses, as well as ordinary citizens. His heroines, like the women of *DM*, are active in the public or civic sphere, but are more often concerned with the freedom of their community than the transmission of power. On the whole, the heroines of *Mulierum Virtutes* are exceptionally virtuous: they are high-minded, generous, chaste, intelligent, and beautiful, in addition to being courageous, and thus combine the best of male and female virtues.[90] Their ἀρετή encompasses a great deal more than bravery and it is probably not a coincidence that the word ἀνδρεία is not found in Plutarch's work.[91] The women of *DM* are frequently much less positive figures. Finally, although the *Mulierum Virtutes* is based on direct acquaintance with earlier historical sources,[92] Plutarch, unlike our anonymous author, does not cite the sources of his tales.

Polyaenus' Strategemata

Polyaenus' *Strategemata* is another work which features tales of outstanding women, Roman, Greek, and barbarian, who acted as individuals or in groups in times of crisis. (We have already seen that *DM* is found in close proximity to Polyaenus in the mss.—above, p. 4.) The *Strategemata* is a collection of stratagems compiled by Polyaenus for Lucius Verus on his Parthian campaign ca. 162 AD.[93]

---

[88] Wicker 1978, 107; Stadter 1965, 10.

[89] McLeod 1991, 21 thinks that Plutarch's treatment of women both in collective groups and as individuals establishes that "women have claims to virtue as individuals and as a gender."

[90] See Wicker 1978 esp. 114–115 for an excellent survey of the qualities attributed to the women of *Mulierum Virtutes*; see too McLeod 1991, 20–21.

[91] Lutz 1947, 44–45.

[92] Stadter 1965, esp. 125–140.

[93] Krentz and Wheeler 1994 is a recent useful edition, with an introduction and translation.

The work consists of eight books of short anecdotes which are taken from many authors and Polyaenus' notices are not dissimilar in length and format to the entries in *DM*. Some of his entries are virtually biographies, while others describe a particular stratagem or incident. Women are featured in the final two books of the *Strategemata* and Polyaenus includes in these books an abridged version of the majority of the tales found in Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes*.[94] Even more interesting is the fact that 5 of the women found in *DM* are also described by Polyaenus: Semiramis, Rhodogyne, Tomyris, Pheretime, and Artemisia all appear in Book 8 of the *Strategemata* (8. 26, 27, 28, 47, 53). A comparison of the two sets of notices for these 5 women does not allow us to reach any conclusive judgments about the relationship between *DM* and Polyaenus. Two of Polyaenus' entries, on Rhodogyne and Artemisia, closely resemble the accounts in *DM*, while his reports on Semiramis and Tomyris bear little relation to their notices in our work. The fifth tale, on Pheretime, falls somewhere in between and partially resembles the account in *DM*.[95] The close parallels in the accounts of Rhodogyne and Artemisia found in the two compositions may indicate that Polyaenus actually consulted *DM* or that both works used a common source. It is clear that Polyaenus—a notorious riffler through the works of others—has made use of one or perhaps several collections telling of the courage and boldness of women, anthologies on ἀρεταὶ γυναικῶν, when compiling this section of his *Strategemata*.[96] He apparently found in these collections alternative versions of the deeds of some of our heroines and this is not surprising. Catalogues such as ours were often copied, altered, and reworked, so that while many of the women remain a constant presence in these anthologies, their actual tales are frequently varied.

Citation of sources

One notable difference between *DM* and the works of both Plutarch and Polyaenus is that while all three authors compile anthologies based on earlier writings, only ADM cites his actual sources. We can view this source citation in two rather different ways: on the one

---

[94] Stadter 1965, 13–29 demonstrates conclusively that the two authors do not make use of a common source—Polyaenus borrows directly from Plutarch.

[95] For detailed comparisons, see the individual essays on these women.

[96] See Melber 1885, 479 and Knott 1884, 66 with n. 1. Knott notes the wide geographical spread of the women described in Book 8 of Polyaenus.

hand it is reminiscent of the practice of learned Alexandrian writers such as Callimachus' pupil, Istrus. Istrus produced historical and antiquarian works by making excerpts from earlier writings and, it seems, regularly cited his sources.[97] But the Alexandrian pupils of Callimachus did not only produce sober works. Callimachus himself compiled a *Collection of the Wonders of the World, Arranged According to Place* telling of παράδοξα, strange and fantastic phenomena in the natural world, and other such anthologies on natural wonders and marvels soon followed. Just as the Peripatetic and Alexandrian biographers stressed the sensational or the unusual in their portraits of people, the paradoxographers emphasized the marvelous and unexpected features of the natural world.[98] Perhaps because their stories are so incredible, the paradoxographers make a point of citing their sources, the authorities for their tales.[99] Romm has an excellent characterization of these collections of marvels: "... the matter-of-fact tone of the catalogue helps balance the exoticism of the wonders themselves ... the frequent citation of sources which typifies this kind of writing also helps bolster authority ... The cataloguer of wonders typically crowds his data into linguistic aggregates rather than discrete units: prolix, hyperextended sentences, or rapid-fire series of clauses."[100] Much of this description can, of course, be applied to *DM*, but the question is whether it is correct to do so. Here the lack of context for our catalogue is sorely felt. Is *DM* a kind of "believe it or not" collection of strange women or is it a series of carefully researched accounts of women used as *exempla* to prove the truth of a (feminist) thesis on the capabilities of women? I shall return to this question below.

Two works attributed to Plutarch should also be noted in this context of collections which include source citations. The *Parallela Minora* (*Mor.* 305a–316b) is a series of brief and unusual tales (cf. παράδοξα 305a), arranged in pairs. The author parallels ancient,

---

[97] Fraser 1972 i, 511–512 and ii, 737–738 nn. 140–145; Pfeiffer 1968, 150–151; cf. Jacoby ad *FGrH* 334 T1 (iii b suppl. i, 618–627).

[98] See Fraser 1972 i, 454.

[99] See e.g. the *Historiae Mirabiles* of Apollonius, esp. sections 7–51 (Westermann 1839, 106–116; Giannini 1965, 120–142). In his brief catalogic survey of natural phenomena, Apollonius regularly cites his sources. Pliny the Elder, when telling of *mirabilia*, frequently quotes these very Hellenistic paradoxographers as *his* source—see Beagon 1992, 8–11.

[100] Romm 1992, 93. Compare McLeod 1991, 3: "for authors seeking a shield ... the catalog's staid format could make new or even startling ideas seem acceptable."

piquant anecdotes of e.g. missing hands, eyes, or heads with corresponding stories from Roman history. The length and format of the individual notices is not unlike those of *DM* and the anecdotes often begin, as in *DM*, with the name and a brief description of the hero. Here too the specific source citations (generally listing author, title, and book number) are an integral part of the notice. Most of the sources cited are, however, late and obscure, and it is possible that the majority of these alleged authorities were simply invented by the unknown author of the *Parallela Minora*.[101] *De Fluviis*, another pseudo-Plutarchean work, tells of rivers, mountains, rocks, and the myths attached to them, and is similarly rich in obscure sources; some of the authors found in the two works overlap.

Two other extant collections or catalogues of brief, unusual tales are the ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα or *Romantic Misfortunes* by Parthenius and the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis. Both these works were preserved together in a single manuscript. The two compositions have the same kind of source citations: brief headings placed before the actual story supposedly record the source of the tale. These headings may well be an addition by later scholars.[102] The *Metamorphoses* deals with transformations of men and women into animals, plants etc. and the individual notices are somewhat longer than those of *DM*. The work is assigned a date in the second or third century AD.[103] Antoninus Liberalis begins his work *in medias res* with the first metamorphosis, but the first century BC writer Parthenius includes an introduction to his *Erotica Pathemata*, a collection of tales of (generally unfortunate) lovers, explaining that the stories assembled are meant to serve Cornelius Gallus as material for the writing of poems. Naturally, women are featured in nearly all these romances, so that Parthenius' work is not unlike a catalogue of women. Although several of his lovelorn heroines play some role in political affairs, either betraying or saving their cities,[104] the women in these melodramatic tales bear little resemblance to the strong-minded queens of *DM*: we have already seen that ADM is not interested in romance as such.

---

[101] See Ziegler 1964, 230–233.
[102] Cf. Celoria 1992, 16–17.
[103] Celoria 1992, 2.
[104] See e.g. Polycrite (no. 9) or Nanis (no. 22).

Catalogues of Women

This brings us to the question of catalogues of women, for *DM* can be seen as a continuation of a very ancient tradition, catalogues or lists of women. Such catalogues go back to Homer and Hesiod and the following *selective* survey of extant lists of women, compiled at various times in the ancient world, is intended to provide a wider perspective in which to place—and interpret—*DM*. We shall look at the various kinds of women who appear in such lists, their characteristic features, and the author's purpose in compiling such a catalogue. If there are similar collections relating to men, I shall try to compare the two catalogues, male and female.[105]

First, a few words about catalogues in general. The earliest ancient catalogues were in verse and were used to enumerate lists of people, actions, or objects: there are e.g. catalogues of ships, fallen warriors, geographical locations, or genealogical information. The appeal of these lists seems to have been a love of codification, a desire to acquire information, and pure pleasure in the sound of the verses.[106] Scholars have postulated the existence of a pre-Homeric oral tradition of catalogue poetry in Ionia[107] and an early Boeotian school of catalogue poetry, associated with Hesiod.[108] The earliest extant catalogues are found in Homer and Hesiod, and they are quite flexible in scope and shape. These lists consist of a series of entries, often linked by a connecting formula. The entries generally contain the same kind of information, which may be as brief as a bare proper name or consist of several elements which can be elaborated.[109] (We have already seen that the notices of *DM* include such repeated elements or building blocks—such as the name and origin of each woman and the source cited—and that the presentation of these elements is varied slightly in the different entries.) The catalogue form is elastic and accordion-like: the individual items or entries enumerated can be added or subtracted at will, making the catalogue longer or shorter, and each individual entry can be re-

---

[105] McLeod 1991 is a recent useful work on ancient and medieval catalogues of women; she neatly sums up a series of questions to be asked about such catalogues on p. 9.

[106] Bowra 1930, 69–81; Kirk 1965, 128; Lamberton 1988, 82–84.

[107] Kakridis 1972, esp. 159–161.

[108] Kirk 1965, 89 and 221.

[109] Edwards 1980, 101; Thalmann 1984, 26.

duced to a skeletal name or object, or expanded to include considerable additional information.[110] At times the lists begin more fully, and the entries become progressively shorter until the catalogue abruptly ends; elsewhere the opposite is true and the entries become increasingly elaborate; in yet other cases the entries are all virtually the same length. Catalogues can also be easily lifted from one context to another. We find such borrowings or overlap already with Homer and Hesiod, but the two authors present similar material in very different fashion. The Hesiodic catalogue, said to represent the "antiquarian, indexing, collecting mentality"[111] is often contrasted, from the scholiasts onward, with Homer's freer and more decorative use of such material. Thus even the earliest catalogues demonstrate how there is room for the individual author's voice behind a seemingly fixed list of facts.[112]

The Nereids in Homer and Hesiod

Let us begin with the simplest form of catalogue, a list of names. In Book 18 of the *Iliad* (39–49) there is a list of the Nereids, the daughters of Nereus and sisters of Thetis. Thetis hears Achilles' cries of grief when he learns of the death of Patroclus and the goddess cries in turn, shaken by her son's distress. She is immediately surrounded by her sisters, the Nereids, who share in her sorrow and Homer pauses to enumerate their names. Their bare names—only three of the 33 have brief epithets attached to their names—are soothing and melodious (cf. e.g. Κυμοθόη and Καλλιάνειρα) and the list lulls, providing a respite before the sorry scene with Achilles.[113] Thetis weeps over her inability to help Achilles, and the Nereids, in sisterly solidarity, weep along with her, acting virtually as a chorus of mourners. They then accompany Thetis on her painful visit to Achilles; later they will lament at Achilles' own funeral (*Od.* 24. 55–59).[114] The Nereids act as a group and are not differentiated in any way

[110] Beye 1968, 89–93.

[111] Beye 1964, 369.

[112] Cf. Butterworth 1986, 41–42: ". . . such catalogues far from being rigidly fixed, offer an opportunity for individual poetic invention."

[113] Bowra 1930, 73; Edwards 1991, 147–150 (ad *Il.* 18. 39–49).

[114] Cf. Edwards 1991, 149 (ad *Il.* 18. 39–49). He suggests that there may have been a similar list of Nereids in the section of the *Aethiopis* which told of Achilles' funeral.

other than their names, but the fact that their names are so evocative and are listed one by one, makes them seem real and effective: these are Thetis' *sisters* who surround and comfort her, not just an anonymous mass of women. The very act of listing or enumerating their names transforms the Nereids from a chorus into a collection of individuals.

There is an even longer list of Nereids, fifty in all, at Hesiod *Theogony* 240–264 and it is illuminating to compare Hesiod's list of nymphs with that of Homer. Hesiod's interest in the Nereids is chiefly genealogical—this is one of the many genealogical catalogues of the *Theogony*—and the names appear in a straightforward list of the children of Nereus, the old man of the sea. Homer's Nereids are Thetis' sisters; Hesiod's are Nereus' daughters. Eighteen of the Nereids are found in both catalogues and the lists are clearly related, if not directly dependent on one another.[115] Once these Nereid names, generic and/or invented for the most part, have entered a list, they can be used again and again by different authors for various purposes. If Homer seems interested in the flow and euphonious sound of the Nereids' names, Hesiod is perhaps more concerned with their meanings, which reflect different aspects of the sea and also point to the daughters' resemblance to their just and truthful father, Nereus. Hesiod uses more epithets than Homer does to describe his Nereids and all his adjectives refer to their physical beauty—they are lovely, rosy-armed, graceful, beautiful etc. Since several of the women are allotted the same description, these epithets do not really serve to distinguish the individual Nereids in any way. What is most impressive about Hesiod's catalogue is the sheer weight of the list, the large number of names, fifty in all, crowded into 20 lines. Hesiod's use of the round number 50 for his catalogue of Nereids (*Theogony* 264), also indicates that he is attempting to codify or regularize the list of the offspring of Nereus. The presentation of the Nereids of the *Theogony* as *women* seems restricted to the epithets assigned to them, which refer only to their beauty. Later in the *Theogony* (337–370) we find a parallel catalogue of the children of Ocean and Tethys, listing first their sons, the rivers, and then their daughters, the Oceanids or nymphs of springs and groves. The two lists of the male and female offspring are virtually identical in form and function, after the initial

[115] See e.g. Butterworth 1986, 39–44 who compares the two passages carefully and argues that Hesiod has used Homer here; cf. Edwards 1991, 149.

gender distinction—rivers are masculine and springs are feminine—is drawn. Nonetheless the male children, the rivers, are described as eddying and swirling, besides being fair, while the Oceanids, like the Nereids with whom they are often confused,[116] are again only allotted epithets which refer to their physical attractions.

To sum up, neither Homer's various Nereids nor those of Hesiod are important as actual individuals. Hesiod lists the women in order to fix them in place or codify them,[117] just as he elsewhere catalogues the offspring, male and female, of other important figures. Homer's Nereids seem to play a more womanly role: they engulf their sister with sympathy and support and the list of their names makes their presence all the more tangible. Homer uses lists of bare names of men to similar effect in somewhat different circumstances. He creates an analogous impression of solidarity among men by enumerating the members of an assembly of soldiers poised to fight (e.g. at *Iliad* 11. 57–60 or 13. 790–792). We regularly find unadorned lists of men's names in another situation as well: the recording by name of a group of fallen warriors (*Iliad* 5. 677–678; 12. 193; 16. 415–417) and perhaps here too the names contribute to a feeling of community or togetherness.[118] The participants in these *androktasiai* have, however, also been described as "literary cannon-fodder, faceless supernumeraries, so to speak, upon the battle scene,"[119] and it is worth remembering that if the women named in catalogues seem, at times, to be no more than convenient genealogical links with no life or personality of their own, the men listed in Homeric catalogues can be mere dead bodies.

In the *Hymn to Demeter* (418–424) we find yet another straightforward list of nymphs, and these women fulfill a role which is a variation on that of Homer's Nereids. Persephone is playing in a meadow with the Oceanids, plucking flowers, when Hades comes to abduct her. We hear of her abduction twice in the hymn (1–21; 405–433),

---

[116] See West 1966, 237. Here too there is some overlap between the names assigned the two groups, Nereids and Oceanids. Some of these names are also found in the list of nymphs who play with Persephone (*Hymn to Demeter* 418–424)—see below, p. 44.

[117] Compare his catalogue of the Muses (*Theogony* 75–79) which fulfills a similar function.

[118] See Edwards 1980, 99 n. 41 for a collection of lists of personal names and epithets without verbs in ancient epic. These lists are either genealogies, lists of warriors—dead or poised to do battle—or variations on the Nereid catalogue.

[119] Beye 1964, 358.

and the actual list of Oceanids is found only in the second version, when Persephone recounts her adventures to Demeter. If in the earlier account, they are referred to in one line (*h. Dem.* 5) simply as a group, here Persephone names her companions to her mother, possibly because they are her friends, and she sees them as individuals.[120] Sixteen of the names found here appear in Hesiod's list of Oceanids (*Theogony* 349–361) and two (Melite and Ianeira) are also included among Homer's Nereids.[121] The Oceanids are a chorus of companions surrounding the young girl and the group serves, along with the various flowers enumerated by Persephone immediately afterwards (*h. Dem.* 425–428; cf. 6–8), as an idyllic backdrop from which she is snatched away.[122] The Oceanids are more passive than Thetis' sisters, Homer's Nereids: they help set the pastoral, peaceful scene but do not intervene in any way when Hades arrives. Persephone mentions 21 Oceanids in all and only 3 have epithets attached to their names; again, these adjectives refer to their physical beauty. Here too the names are lovely, with much alliteration and assonance in the list. There is another brief list of women's names in the *Hymn*, the names of the daughters of Keleos and Metaneira whom Demeter meets when they gather at the well to draw water (105–110; cf. 174–179). In this mini-catalogue, the young girls are likened to goddesses in the flower of youth, immediately reminding us of Persephone at play with the Oceanids.[123] This brief list of girls is also balanced in the *Hymn* by a short catalogue of the prominent men in Eleusis (149–155; cf. 473–476), for Kallidike, the oldest and most beautiful of the girls, tells Demeter of the town's important men. These men are described as just, clever and lordly; we do not hear of their physical appearance.

Choir members, priestesses, and Pythagoreans

In Alcman's *Partheneion* (64–77) we again find a twofold, literary use of a catalogue of young girls. According to a recent reconstruction of this fragmentary poem, the enumeration of the rank and file members of the choir serves two purposes. The eleven beautiful and richly

[120] Foley 1994, 60.
[121] See Richardson 1974, 287–290 for a detailed analysis of the list.
[122] Cf. Foley 1994, 33-34, 36.
[123] Cf. Foley 1994, 41.

adorned girls of the choir are contrasted playfully with the two pre-eminent choir leaders, Agido and Hagesichora, and also neatly parallel the catalogue of eleven male warriors listed in the first section of the poem.[124] The fact that the girls' names are mentioned in the poem may point to the role played by Spartan women in the public sphere.[125]

There were also simple prose catalogues of women's names and at times these dry, factual lists of female names provide useful or unexpected information. Lists or catalogues of priestesses, such as the list of priestesses of Hera at Argos, were used for chronological purposes, e.g. by Hellanicus in his Ἱερεῖαι. In Athens there were similar eponymous lists of priestesses. Priestesses were, in fact, important figures and "in the sacred and ritual activities of the community the active presence of women in the public world is not merely tolerated but required."[126] Another bare enumeration of women's names which is far from being uninteresting or inconsequential is the list of Pythagorean women included by Iamblichus in his catalogue of Pythagoreans (*De Vita Pythagorica* 267). This female catalogue follows upon a much lengthier list of male Pythagoreans, and while some of the 17 women listed are the wives, sisters, and daughters of the 218 men named in the catalogue, other women have no connection with counterparts in the male catalogue: the names have not been invented simply to correspond with those of men.[127] The catalogue may be based on a lost work by Philochorus "Collection of heroines or Pythagorean women" and, as Jacoby notes, Philochorus' "restriction to women is remarkable and possibly meant to fill a gap."[128] In any event, the very enumeration of such women is valuable for the indication it gives of the active role played by women in early Pythagoreanism. In a certain sense, our catalogue of women in *DM* is similar, for even without the information provided in the notices in addition to the women's bare names, the purported existence of some 14 outstandingly courageous and intelligent women is noteworthy.

---

[124] The analysis is that of Robbins 1994.

[125] Fantham *et al.* 1994, 60.

[126] Gould 1980, 55.

[127] See Demand 1982, 132–135, 167–168. Hawley 1994, 71 notes that these women are described by Iamblichus as "the most illustrious" (αἱ ἐπιφανέσταται 267), perhaps implying that there were others.

[128] Συναγωγὴ ἡρωίδων ἤτοι Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν *FGrH* 328 T1, no. 25; Jacoby ad *FGrH* 328, nos. 25–26 (iii b (suppl.) text, 380).

Consorts and courtesans

Other catalogues dealt with less outstanding or respectable women. There were, for instance, lists of women who were responsible for causing wars or destroying houses. One such list is found in the mss. immediately after the text of *DM* and Theophrastus seems to have written about such women as well.[129] Several ancient authors apparently produced books on courtesans: Athenaeus (583d–e) mentions works by Aristophanes of Byzantium, Apollodorus, and Gorgias of Athens.[130] Indeed, we find such a catalogue of *hetairai* in Book 13 of Athenaeus' own *Deipnosophistae* (571e ff.), replete with anecdotes.[131]

Genealogical catalogues

Let us return to Homer and to a charming instance of a more sophisticated use of a catalogue of women, *Iliad* 14. 315–328. Hera, armed with Aphrodite's girdle, seduces Zeus in order to lull him to sleep and interfere in the fighting. Zeus finds her attractive as never before and tactlessly tells her so by listing all his past mistresses: none, says Zeus, aroused the love he now feels for Hera. Zeus' former loves are listed in ascending order, from mortals to goddesses, and for nearly all the women he mentions the sons they bore him. Not all of the women are mentioned by their own name; some are identified through their husbands (e.g. Ixion's wife) or fathers (e.g. Phoenix' daughter). The sons, who *are* named, are often described at greater length and with more epithets than their mothers, who are either lovely in some way (Danae, Demeter) or glorious (Leto). The emphasis on sons in this undignified survey of Zeus' past love affairs makes it clear that our list has its origins in genealogical catalogue poetry. Indeed we find in Hesiod *Theogony* (886–923, 938–944) a similar list of Zeus' consorts, divine and mortal.[132] Hesiod's list is longer and more comprehensive: all the women are noted by name and described at greater length, and we hear of their daughters as well as their sons. But in Hesiod the women are nonetheless genealogical

---

[129] See Westermann 1839, 218 and Theophrastus frr. 625–627 in Fortenbaugh *et al.* 1992 ii, 468–473; cf. Athen. 560b–f.

[130] Cf. Hawley 1993, 88 n. 4. A work on famous courtesans περὶ ἐπισήμων πορνῶν is attributed to Suetonius as well (p. 302 Roth).

[131] Hawley 1993, esp. 84–86 has an analysis of the catalogue in Athenaeus.

[132] Cf. Janko 1992, 202 (ad *Il.* 14. 313–328).

links, mothers of Zeus' children, while Homer adapts this traditional material to comic effect, having the god enumerate his extramarital affairs to his jealous wife, while she sets him a trap. "If only one could see Hera's face as his list continues!"[133] Here, then, we find two different ways of cataloguing women combined: the women are important both as objects of passion and as mothers of heroes.

The outstanding catalogue of the mothers of heroes is the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* or *Ehoiai.* This work is preserved only in fragmentary form, but the fragments are substantial enough to give us a good idea of what the composition was like.[134] Hesiod's *Theogony* ends with unions between goddesses and mortal men and the *Catalogue,* which is clearly meant to be a continuation of the *Theogony,* opens with matings between gods and mortal women. The description of the offspring of these unions, the heroes, and their descendants, leads to a genealogical survey of all the various leaders and races of the heroic age in Greece. These genealogies are organized according to the women, the mothers, wives, and daughters of the various heroes, and the phrase ἢ οἵη "or such as she who . . .", which gives the *Ehoiai* its name, serves as a linking device between the various entries and sections of the catalogue. One reason for using women, rather than men as a basis for genealogies may be the truism *mater certa, pater semper incertus est*; the women are, in any event, "subordinated to the overall patrilinear arrangement of the genealogical material."[135] Nonetheless the *Catalogue* women are clearly more than mere biological incubators of heroes and their characters and deeds seem to have been described, along with the adventures of their suitors, sons, and fathers.[136] Alcmene, for instance, is exceptionally tall and beautiful, wise and loyal (fr. 195 M.–W. = *Scut.* 1–10), a joy to her parents (fr. 193). The lovely Atalanta is unusually athletic, a better runner than most men (frr. 72–76), and Mestra is very clever

---

133 Edwards 1987, 249; cf. Bowra 1930, 74.

134 See Merkelbach and West 1967, 1–120 for the text and M. L. West 1985 for a reconstruction of the composition.

135 Finkelberg 1991, 308 n. 23. M. L. West 1985, 168 suggests that the emphasis on female ancestors in the *Catalogue* may be due to the work's alleged origin at Locris, an area associated with matriarchalism.

136 *Pace* McLeod 1991, 13–14; contrast Lefkowitz 1986, 34–36, 41 and Cohen 1989–90. M. L. West 1985, in his survey of precedents and parallels to the *Ehoiai,* indeed in his whole book, ignores the fact that it is a catalogue of *women*—cf. p. 2 "The poem could be considered as being about those celebrated women or *more broadly* [italics mine DLG] as being about the genealogy of heroes."

(fr. 43a). Characterizations such as these explain why Lucian (67.1) terms the Hesiodic *Catalogue* γυναικῶν ἀρετάς and it seems that these women were more than beautiful objects; "apparently, the race of heroes cannot exist without women of heroic caliber."[137] If the women of the *Ehoiai* were indeed presented as positive, independent figures, this is in decided contrast to the misogynist Hesiod's generally negative view of women, as evinced by his myth of Pandora (*Works and Days* 53–105; *Theogony* 570–616).[138] It is worth noting that scholars generally deny the attribution of the *Catalogue* to Hesiod on linguistic grounds;[139] the strikingly different presentation of women could be an additional consideration.

Odysseus in the underworld

Several of the heroines included in the *Ehoiai* are also found among the group of women whom Odysseus sees in the underworld (*Odyssey* 11. 225–330).[140] The list of heroines encountered by Odysseus in Hades is the longest and most complex catalogue of women found in Homer. Odysseus tells the Phaeacians of his various adventures, including his visit to Hades. While in the underworld, he sees and speaks with a series of mythological heroines and he describes these encounters at considerable length. This is a genuine and deliberate catalogue of *women*: it is framed at both ends by two other women, for Odysseus meets these ghostly heroines immediately after conversing with his own dead mother, Anticleia, and when he finishes telling his Phaeacian audience about the women, Queen Arete is the first of his listeners to react. These two "framing" figures, Arete and Anticleia—the wife and mother of rulers who are nonetheless vivid figures in their own right—resemble the heroines of whom Odysseus tells. (And resemble, of course, the women of *DM* as well.) The catalogue of women is followed—after an interlude or "intermezzo" consisting of an exchange between Odysseus and the Phaeacians—by a list of the male figures whom Odysseus encounters in Hades, so that there is a parallel catalogue of men to balance that of the women.

---

[137] Lefkowitz 1986, 36.

[138] Vernant 1981 is the classic analysis.

[139] See e.g. West 1966, 48–49, 397–399 and the very title of M. L. West 1985. Janko 1982, 85–87 is less certain that Hesiod was not the author of the *Catalogue*.

[140] See the invaluable commentary of Heubeck in Heubeck *et al.* 1989, 90–97 and the further references there.

After Odysseus parts from his mother, vainly trying to embrace her ghost, Persephone urges a group of women forward. Odysseus deliberately contrives to speak to each woman separately, having them drink the vitalizing blood one by one, but except for the first woman, Tyro, there is no attempt to portray these heroines as actually conversing with him and the encounters rapidly turn into a catalogue of 14 women.[141] These mythological women are first and foremost daughters, wives, and mothers of famous men—cf. ὅσσαι ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρες (11. 227; cf. 329)—and it is difficult to categorize the entire group beyond that and point to one feature which is common to all the heroines. There is definitely a genealogical cast to some of the material. Tyro, the woman who is mentioned first and has the longest description, points to one distinct element. She is the mother of the Aeolid line and several other of the women present (Chloris, Pero, Clymene etc.) are her descendants.[142] Other groups of heroines are linked to Thebes, Attica etc. so that the women of the catalogue can be seen as "convenient referents to history . . . incubators of heroes who . . . represent the various Greek tribes."[143] Tyro was raped by Poseidon and bore him two sons and four more of the underworld heroines (Antiope, Alcmene, Leda, Iphimedeia) had unions with gods and bore their children, along with more mortal offspring. We are reminded of Zeus' catalogue of mistresses: indeed Alcmene, mother of Heracles, is found in both these lists. Here too the famous sons (e.g. Amphion and Zethus, Otus and Ephialtes) and their adventures are allotted more space than their mothers, but all the women are at least named. As in the Zeus catalogue (and in *DM*!), the heroines are generally identified and "placed" as the daughters, wives, or mothers of notable men. A few women are allotted brief epithets mentioning their beauty, majesty, and descent. The treacherous Eryphile is termed hateful (στυγερήν 326) and is given a story of her own, for we are told that she betrayed her husband for gold. We also hear of the anguish and suicide of Epicaste (i.e. Jocasta), the mother and wife of Oedipus, and of the killing of Ariadne. Thus not all the women are mere genealogical pegs and some of the catalogue's heroines are noteworthy for their own actions and not just as the

---

[141] It should be recalled that *DM* is also a catalogue of 14 women—is this sheer coincidence? In Nepos' brief list *de regibus* there are 14 kings.

[142] See e.g Heubeck in Heubeck *et al.* 1989, 92 and Stanford 1961, 390, both ad *Od.* 11. 235 ff.

[143] McLeod 1991, 14; cf. M. L. West 1985, 32.

female relations of heroes. The brief mention of women such as Phaedra and Procris must be due to their mythological roles as unfaithful wives, rather than their progeny, and this leads us to yet another view of the heroines' catalogue, i.e. that it is meant to stress "the central theme of fidelity to home and to family."[144] What sort of catalogue is this list of underworld heroines? Partly genealogical, partly ethnic or geographical, partly a series of *exempla* of happy and unhappy wives, this catalogue is interesting precisely because it is so wide-ranging.

The list of heroes whom Odysseus sees in Hades, the corresponding catalogue of men, is no neater or more orderly. We have already seen that these two catalogues are separated by Odysseus' exchange with the Phaeacians, but there is an interesting link between the final woman in the first catalogue, Eryphile, and Agamemnon, the first man in the list of underworld heroes, for Agamemnon, like Eryphile's husband Amphiaraus, was the victim of a perfidious wife, the δολόμητις Clytemnestra.[145] Agamemnon speaks at length against all women, saying how even the best—such as Penelope—should not be party to all of a man's secrets. His tirade (*Od.* 11. 441 ff.) is the earliest instance of misogynist generalizations on untrustworthy women found in Greek literature, and Agamemnon's words—following upon the list of unfaithful wives who round off the catalogue of heroines—point the way, perhaps, to later works which catalogue the vices of women, such as Semonides' poem on women. After conversing with Agamemnon, Odysseus addresses two other dead Greek heroes, Achilles and Ajax. Next comes a series of more remote mythological figures, both positive and negative. These dead heroes (and villains) are not, of course, presented simply as fathers or sons or genealogical links. They are men who are either engaged in the same activities as in life (Minos judges, Orion hunts, Heracles brandishes his weapons) or are undergoing punishments incurred by their activities in their lifetimes (Tityus, Tantalus, Sisyphus). Thus the men found in Odysseus' catalogue of underworld ghosts are much more active and energetic figures than the women, but both groups are similarly varied.

---

[144] Toohey 1992, 55.

[145] See Heubeck in Heubeck *et al.* 1989, 97 (ad *Od.* 11. 326–327).

Misogynist catalogues: lazy and licentious women

The different kinds of women found in this Homeric catalogue point the way to the remaining kinds of collections we shall look at: misogynist catalogues on the vices of women[146] and lists of love-stricken women who are motivated by sexual passion. Semonides' famous satire on women (fr. 7 West) is an outstanding piece of invective. In this catalogue, it is not actual women, whether historical or mythological, who are listed, but a series of different character types, various species of the race of women.[147] Perhaps the closest "masculine" equivalent to Semonides' work is the much later prose *Characters* by Theophrastus, a collection of sketches of various character types, including the boaster, the stingy man, and the chatterbox. Theophrastus does not include any women.[148] Nine of the 10 types of women described by the 7th century BC poet Semonides are negative creatures and these lazy, lewd women are said to be created from animals such as a sow, a vixen and a bitch.[149] The misogynist poet praises only one woman, the bee woman, who is an outstanding, beautiful wife who stays at home with her husband, tends his property and family, and does not consort with other females. Neither the bee woman nor any of her sorry companions in the catalogue bear any resemblance to the independent "manly" figures of *DM.* Indeed, Semonides opens his poem with the declaration χωρὶς γυναικὸς θεὸς ἐποίησεν νόον "the god made woman's mind separately (from man's),"[150] and his much maligned women have none of the qualities traditionally associated with men.

This is not true of the mythological women listed as *exempla* in a choral ode of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* (585–652). These monstrous women kill male members of their immediate family—sons (Alathea), fathers (Scylla), and husbands (Clytemnestra and the Lemnian women)—by treachery and the chorus blame their actions on ruthless passions (παντόλμους ἔρωτας 597). Whether these women are condemned as powerful females who annihilate males or as deceitful murderers of

---

[146] Rogers 1966, 22–40 is a brief, but useful survey of misogyny in Greek and Roman literature.

[147] Loraux 1993, 72–110 discusses the "race of women" in Hesiod and Semonides.

[148] Humphreys 1983, 40 and 50 n. 6 notes how men in pre-Hellenistic Greece are characterized in term of their political affiliations or occupations, while women are classified according to their personal characteristics.

[149] Phocylides (fr. 2 Diehl) is a later poem of similar conception.

[150] See Lloyd-Jones 1975, 63–64 for this interpretation of the line.

their closest relatives, they are forceful instances of evil women.[151] We find similar, lengthier catalogues of mythological women who demonstrate the violence of female passion in Latin poets such as Ovid (*Ars* 1. 279–342) and Propertius (3. 19): the two authors use many of the same *exempla*. These Latin authors were, it seems, influenced by Hellenistic writers of catalogue poetry.[152]

Juvenal *Satire* 6 is a misogynist catalogue of all sorts of evil women. In this satire, Juvenal combines a delineation of character types, such as is found in Semonides, with vivid depictions of actual, contemporary women and references to earlier mythological figures. His women are above all licentious and unbridled in their sexual behavior, but two of his sketches of female types are more interesting for our purposes: the upper class Roman woman who plays at being a gladiator, with fighting equipment and all (246–267), and the bluestocking who with her "learned" analyses silences everyone. Juvenal suggests that she adopts men's clothing, not just their interests (434–456). In other words, Juvenal's woman warrior is ridiculous and his intelligent woman is too manly and there is no place for the women of *DM* in this Roman poet's world. The *Satire* ends with a series of *exempla* of mythological women who have killed their husbands, and two of these women, Procris and Eriphyle, are found in the catalogues of underworld heroines of both Homer and Virgil.

Virgil, Ovid, and Jerome

It is interesting to compare Virgil's catalogue of women in Book 6 of the *Aeneid* (6. 440 ff.) with the Homeric original, for Aeneas' adventures in the underworld are closely modeled upon those of Odysseus. Aeneas descends to the underworld and quickly passes through several groups of spirits. He then comes to the *Lugentes campi*, the Grieving Fields, where those who were consumed by harsh love, *durus amor* (*Aen.* 6. 441), are found.[153] In this gloomy spot, Aeneas first sees Phaedra, Procris, and Eryphile—three women from the Homeric underworld catalogue—and then a further three mythological hero-

---

[151] See Lefkowitz 1986, 121 vs. Zeitlin 1978, 164–165 and Gould 1980, 55–56.

[152] See Hollis 1977, 91–92, who mentions Hermesianax, Phanocles, and Euphorion as possible influences on Ovid.

[153] Norden 1957, 247 suggests that Virgil made use here of catalogues developed by Hellenistic poets, perhaps even a catalogue of famous heroines in Hades (κατάλογος τῶν κλεινῶν ἡρωινῶν τῶν ἐν ᾅδου).

ines, Evadne, Pasiphae, and Laodamia. Next comes Caeneus, who changes from woman to man and then back to woman again. All seven of these women are described only briefly—5 are simply named—and it seems that they are mentioned only in order to lead up to Dido herself. Some of the first six women are faithful wives and others are treacherous, but all die for love; all seven women reflect different aspects of Dido and point to different facets of her character.[154] Generally the various women listed in catalogues in Homer and elsewhere seem to be of equal importance, even if their entries are of unequal length, but in Virgil's list there is one central figure, Dido, and the other heroines are present in order to illuminate her. Another difference between Homer's heroines and those of Virgil is the emphasis Virgil places on his women as figures in love. The underworld women of the *Aeneid*, unlike those of the *Odyssey*, are categorized by one central characteristic: they have died for love and their destructive passion is all that matters about them.[155] Macrobius reports that Virgil was the pupil of Parthenius, and he may well have been influenced by his teacher's collection of *Romantic Misfortunes* here.[156] We have already seen that Ovid and Propertius also compiled lists of women swept away by passion, but their mythological women, unlike those of Virgil, are uniformly negative. Later, Hyginus will include many of these women in his *Fabulae* (243) in a brief list of women who committed suicide. Hyginus' suicidal women all kill themselves for love, but the men in his parallel catalogue of male suicides (242) are not always motivated by romance.[157]

The women found in Ovid's *Heroides* are also obsessed with love. This work is composed of a series of letters addressed by women such as Penelope, Phaedra, Medea, and Sappho (the only historical figure) to the men they love. These women are separated either physically or emotionally from their lovers and use their letters to plead with their absent partners to return. Often these tearful heroines threaten suicide or revenge. Ovid's women, whatever their achievements in the past, are totally engrossed in their emotions and consequently have little in common with the women of *DM*. Dido is the only woman found in both these works, but Ovid's Dido writes

---

[154] See West 1975, 237–239 and 255–257; Perret 1964.

[155] Cf. McLeod 1991, 14–18.

[156] Austin 1977, 158.

[157] Two of the women in *DM*, Dido and the Egyptian Nitocris, also commit suicide for love, but this is far from being the main theme of our work.

to Aeneas, who does not even appear in *DM*'s version of her tale. The *Heroides* is, for our purposes, most interesting when viewed in terms of its form or structure as a catalogue. There is no introduction to the series of epistles, no statement of the author's purpose and intentions, and these letters, the individual "entries" in the catalogue, are presented at random, in no discernible order. In addition, while each entry or letter deals with a specific woman who bears no relation to the others, the letters when taken together reveal certain structures or patterns in their tales.[158] In these formal features, then, the *Heroides* resembles and casts light upon *DM*.

Dido is again the only figure from *DM* found in our last catalogue of women, St. Jerome's *Against Jovinian* (1. 41–49).[159] Unlike Ovid's heroine, Jerome's Dido does not pine away for Aeneas, for the Christian author uses a version of her tale close to that given in our text and she is mentioned as an outstanding instance of a chaste woman who does not marry a second time and chooses to die instead.[160] In his polemical pamphlet, Jerome attacks Jovinian for stating that the sexually abstinent are not superior to married people and he uses a wide-ranging series of *exempla* from pagan literature to demonstrate that chastity is the better way of life. Jerome first lists a series of outstanding virgins—goddesses, mythological heroines, and Greek and Roman women (1. 41–42)—and then enumerates a whole collection of chaste widows, Greek, Roman, and barbarian, who are reluctant to remarry (1. 43–46). Neither the virgins nor the married women are always named: many are presented as their fathers' daughters or husbands' wives. Next comes a group of notorious wives, including such familiar figures as Clytemnestra and Eriphyle (1. 48), and the catalogue ends with another list of virtuous women (1. 49). Some of the entries in Jerome's catalogue are bare names, while for other women we are given an account of their doings. Jerome frequently cites his pagan sources and displays a great deal of erudition, but most of it is, it seems, secondhand and based on a lost work by Porphyry, which incorporated earlier writings—and presumably earlier catalogues or lists of *exempla*—by Aristotle and Theophrastus.[161] Jerome is a fascinating example not of the devil quoting Scripture

---

[158] See Jacobson 1974, 376–380 and 407–409.
[159] The text is in *Patrologia Latina* (Migne) vol. 23, cols. 211–337.
[160] See Lord 1969 for an excellent discussion of Dido as an example of chastity.
[161] Bickel 1915.

for his purposes, but of a saint quoting and twisting pagan *exempla* for reasons of his own, so that we find unexpected figures such as Candaules' wife, for instance, held up as an example of chastity.[162] If earlier catalogues such as those of the underworld heroines in Homer and Virgil include faithful and faithless wives together in one group, Jerome separates his women into two distinct lists of good and bad females. He also clearly demarcates the virtues associated with women (chastity, purity, and continence) from those of men (rhetorical ability, political and military success 1. 49).[163] The difference between Jerome's outlook on the capabilities of women and that implied in *DM* is apparent. Nonetheless, Dido finds a place in both catalogues and this teaches us something about the flexibility of *exempla*. Dido can be a lovelorn heroine (Ovid), a symbol of chastity (Jerome), or a brave woman who founds a city (*DM*), according to the needs of the compiler of a catalogue.[164] It may not be a coincidence that the names of two further women found in *DM*, Artemisia and Rhodogyne, also appear in Jerome, even if they are in fact different figures in the two catalogues.[165] We have seen how entries found in earlier catalogues of women were often appropriated and altered by later writers. Generally it is the woman's story which is adapted and altered; here it seems as if only the woman's name survives and a homonymous figure is introduced in her stead.

DM *as a catalogue of women*

It is time to sum up what we have learned about *DM* as a catalogue of women. First of all, our anonymous text clearly *is* a catalogue and resembles several others in the random order of its entries, its use of male relatives to place or identify the female figures, and the possession of a central theme or quality common to all the women included. In the majority of the catalogues we have looked at, the two characteristics associated with the women are their beauty and sexual passion. ADM avoids describing the appearance or sexual

[162] Cf. Hdt. 1. 8–12.

[163] Cf. McLeod 1991, 39–45.

[164] Cf. Lord 1969, 39 and see Macdonald 1987b for a comparable survey of the "template" provided by the warrior queen Boadicea, who is portrayed in very different ways in the various versions of her tale.

[165] Jerome's Artemisia is Mausolus' wife and his Rhodogyne is the daughter of Darius—see below, p. 216 and 157.

adventures of the queens of *DM*, and this omission is probably deliberate: *his* women are interesting in a different way, outstanding for their bravery and intelligence. These qualities, courage and cleverness, are rarely stressed in catalogues of women and Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes* is the only near parallel that comes to mind. While in some catalogues both virtuous and wicked women are found, in others the women are all of a kind, almost invariably a bad kind. Our catalogue *DM* includes both "good" and "bad" women, but these categories do not seem particularly relevant and it is not easy to determine the attitude of our compiler towards his list. Clearly ADM is not a misogynist, like Semonides or Juvenal. It seems equally clear that our anonymous author, unlike Plutarch or Jerome, is not particularly concerned with the moral fiber of the women he describes.

The women included in *DM* are a very restricted group. In other catalogues the women can be character types, actual figures, both mythological and historical, groups and individuals; Juvenal's *Satire* 6 includes all these kinds of women. The women of *DM* seem to have been chosen after due deliberation: there are no groups, only individuals; no mythological heroines, only purportedly historical figures; no poetesses, priestesses, or ordinary individuals, just queens; no Roman women, only Greek and barbarian ones; all the women belong to a relatively early period of history.[166] The geographical spread of the women of *DM* is wide, and the women are all (with the possible exception of Atossa) of different nationalities. Thus our catalogue, despite the random order of its entries, is rather carefully structured and less free-wheeling than the majority of the lists we have looked at.

The Anonymous Author: Some Speculations

The careful selection of the women of *DM* has important implications concerning both the compilation and purpose behind our catalogue. It is not an altogether simple matter to come up with such a wide geographical range of queens. One possibility is that ADM has invested a considerable amount of research in producing his list, combing the authors he cites, along with others, for a certain kind of woman ruler. (It is, in fact, an interesting exercise to try to come up

[166] Compare the tendency of writers of the Second Sophistic to omit historical subjects and *exempla* past the time of Alexander the Great.

with other women who would make suitable candidates for inclusion in *DM*. What of Telesilla, the Argive poetess turned warrior? Or Mania, who takes over her husband's satrapy after he dies? Or, for that matter, Candaules' wife who brings about the rule of a new dynasty in Lydia?)[167] Another possibility is that ADM had at his disposal one, or perhaps several rather comprehensive collections which included a broad spectrum—geographical, historical, and ethnic—of women, allowing him to pick and choose his entries at will. Of these two hypotheses—our anonymous author compiling his catalogue *ab ovo* or else sifting through earlier collections—the second seems more likely. We have seen that from the earliest catalogues onwards, lists of women were reworked, adapted, expanded, and contracted by subsequent authors. It is worth recalling here the series of catalogues of notable women used by the sophist Sopatros and the collections which apparently preceded Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes*.[168] We can easily imagine a whole variety of catalogues which ADM might have consulted: catalogues of famous queens, of women who came into contact with the Persian king, of stratagems used by women to defend their country, of heroines in Ctesias or Herodotus etc. Indeed, it is very likely that some kind of collection based on Herodotus underlies our text, for half of the women in *DM* are found in Herodotus' *History*, and the Halicarnassian is used as the source for 5 of these seven queens. If ADM did in fact compile his collection with the aid of earlier catalogues, this need not mean that his acquaintance with the authors he cites is only secondhand.[169] Since the notices of *DM*—the entries in our catalogue—are all cast in the same mold, they were plainly edited together as a collection, and not simply copied verbatim from various earlier lists. It seems likely, then, that after choosing a woman from an earlier catalogue, ADM went back to an original source which told her tale, refreshing his memory and writing his own précis of the text.

Why does ADM both vary and limit the women of *DM* and how did he decide which women to include? What is the rationale behind our collection? Here, there are several possible hypotheses. We can, it seems, dismiss the idea that ADM is interested in the women

---

[167] See Plutarch *Mor.* 245c–f; Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 10 ff.; Hdt. 1. 8–12 respectively. Various other women who could have been included in *DM* are discussed in the individual essays below.

[168] See above, pp. 33–35.

[169] See above, p. 31 on ADM's use of the sources he cites.

purely as paradoxical creatures. While it is true that his factual, prosaic presentation is not at odds with the tone normally used in collections of marvels (above, p. 38), the fact that the more sensational features of these women's lives as well as details of their beauty and romantic involvements are ignored seems to indicate that our author did not want to portray these heroines simply as unusual figures.

A rhetor?

A passage from the rhetorical handbook by the first century AD sophist Theon (*Progymnasmata* 9) is worth mentioning here.[170] Theon, in the course of demonstrating ways to "prove" either that men are braver than women or women braver than men, uses three women from *DM* as instances of courageous women.[171] Theon's discussion indicates that an analysis of the relative bravery of the sexes was a rhetorical *topos*, and women such as ours were ideally suited (and actually used) to illustrate arguments on the topic.

Perhaps, then, *DM* is the work of a skillful pupil, challenged by his teacher to produce *exempla* for a rhetorical exercise on outstanding, powerful women. A list of such women need not imply an appreciation of their unusual abilities. In Aristophanes, for instance, a grumbling male chorus compares Lysistrata and her friends to the likes of Artemisia and the Amazons, finding all these women an equal threat to the natural order of things (*Lys.* 672–681). When the emperor Julian lists a series of warrior queens (all of whom appear in *DM*), he then adds that while these women provide exciting material for orators, no one would actually like to be married to such a woman. A wife like Penelope, who took care of her family and kept away from the assembly and the battlefield, is much to be preferred, he concludes (*Or.* 3. 127a–c). Thus ADM may have assembled his collection for illustrative purposes and when he presents a series of women from diverse areas, his chief interest could be in demonstrating his wide learning.

---

[170] See Hock and O'Neil 1986, 63–64 on Theon's date.

[171] The three women he cites are Artemisia, Tomyris, and Semiramis. He mentions only one other woman, Sparethra, another Ctesian heroine who would not be out of place in *DM*—see below, on Tomyris, p. 200.

Hellenistic queens

We have seen (above, p. 30) that *DM* is in all likelihood a Hellenistic work and that the earliest date that can be assigned to our composition is the late second or early first century BC. Perhaps ADM was interested in intelligent and powerful women in the wake of actual instances of contemporary, independent Hellenistic queens—such as Eurydice, Berenice II, and Cleopatra—who actively participated in government or took to the battlefield.[172] The Book of Judith which tells of an independent and warlike widow was composed at the turn of the second century BC, i.e. at the time we have tentatively assigned to *DM*, and may be an indication of the interest aroused by such emancipated women at that time.[173] While Judith's tale is fictional, her story, like those of the women of *DM*, is set against a historical background. It is worth noting parenthetically how distinct Judith and the women of *DM* are from the romantic heroines of Greek novels. There is a world of difference between the warrior queen Semiramis described by Ctesias and ADM and the simpering, love struck Semiramis who appears in the fragments of the *Ninus* romance.[174] Perhaps, then, ADM compiled his catalogue of women to point to historical precedents to the powerful queens of his time.

A philosopher?

But our anonymous author may have collected these women for more serious philosophical purposes. The diverse nationalities of these female rulers and their alleged historicity suggest that they are related to a more specific argument on the nature and capabilities of women. Let us try to formulate the theoretical argument which may implicitly underlie our collection of women. Numerous nations, both Greek and barbarian, can boast of having had successful and powerful queens, this argument would run. Women, no matter what their nationality—the argument would continue—have proven capable of ruling their countries, overseeing the smooth transition of power, building great works, and actually taking to the battlefield if the need arose. Furthermore, our hypothetical argument concludes, these in-

---

172 See Pomeroy 1984, 3–40 for a survey of the role, activities, and powers of Hellenistic queens; cf. Fantham *et al.* 1994, 136–163 and Carney 1995.

173 Moore 1985, 67; see above, p. 15.

174 See Pervo 1991, esp. 159 n. 71 and below, p. 73.

dividual women are all historical figures, not legendary ones, and their tales are attested to by reputable writers. This reconstruction of the rationale behind the assortment of women in *DM* is, of course, speculative, but it is not at odds with the specific characteristics of our catalogue of women.

The notices in *DM* would be, on this hypothesis, a series of *exempla* meant to corroborate the truth of a fairly unorthodox thesis on the capacities of women. We have seen that the roots of such an approach to women can be found already in 5th century Athens and Plato's *Republic* is the outstanding expression of this attitude (above, p. 25). Later philosophical schools also believed—in theory, if not in practice—in the equality of the sexes and argued that there was no difference between the nature or virtue of men and women.[175] Musonius Rufus, a Stoic philosopher of the 1st century AD, is perhaps the strongest proponent of such equality: he argues that girls should receive the same education as boys, that women should be trained in philosophy, and, most interesting of all from our point of view, that women can be as courageous as men, as can be seen from the example of the Amazons.[176] In other words, in the first century AD Musonius Rufus would have found the women of *DM* no less useful as *exempla* to corroborate his argument than Plato would have in the fourth century BC. Our anonymous author may well have compiled his catalogue of intelligent and courageous women, some time after the close of the second century BC, in association with a philosophical school—be it Stoic, Cynic, or Epicurean—which claimed that women's abilities were commensurate with those of men.

Pamphile

Finally, it is hard to resist one last hypothesis about the identity and author of our collection—that ADM was, in fact, a woman. There is one woman who would be well qualified to produce a catalogue such as ours, Pamphile of Epidaurus.[177] The learned Pamphile, who

[175] See the references cited by Stadter 1965, 3–5; Cantarella 1987, 56–57 and cf. Hawley 1994, 71–76.

[176] See Stobaeus 2. 31. 126 and 123; cf. Lutz 1947, 38–49. Musonius even notes that while women are generally weaker than men and should be assigned lighter indoor tasks, occasionally it may be more appropriate for frail men to do women's work.

[177] Suda s.v. Παμφίλη; Photius codex 175, 119b; see Fantham *et al.* 1994, 368–369.

lived in the 1st century AD, is said to have written 33 historical books and several treatises. Particularly interesting for our purposes is her three volume epitome of Ctesias' *Persica*, for two of the entries in *DM* are taken from Ctesias' history, and the first notice, that on Semiramis, is a succinct and accurate summary of nearly two books of the *Persica*. Photius tells us that Pamphile chose to present her material in an interesting rather than an orderly manner, separating the historical material she read into miscellaneous collections. One such collection could be *DM* with its random order of women. Photius also states that Pamphile's style was at times quite plain (as, he adds condescendingly, is only to be expected of a woman) and again this is an apt description of the style of our sub-literary text. Pamphile's works were later ascribed either to her father or her husband and perhaps her name was detached from the text of *DM* at some stage.

To sum up, *DM* may have been compiled for curiosity's sake, as part of a rhetorical exercise or argument, to point to historical precedents to powerful Hellenistic queens, to buttress a philosophical position on women's capabilities, or simply by a learned woman.

PART TWO

THE INDIVIDUAL WOMEN

Semiramis

Sources: Ctesias *Persica*, Books 1–2 = *FGrH* 688 F1a–n; Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F1.
Related Sources: Herodotus 1. 184; Polyaenus 8. 26; Deinon *FGrH* 690 F7; Berossus *FGrH* 680 F5. 25, F8; Justin 1. 1–2; Lucian *De Dea Syria* 14, 33. Suda s.v. Σεμίραμις.[1]

Semiramis is the outstanding female ruler, perhaps the very first woman who comes to mind when we think of an independent queen.[2] She appears time and again in ancient sources as an instance of an exceptional leader and is often mentioned as one of a series of *exempla* of eminent women.[3] In later, medieval catalogues of notable women, such as Boccaccio's *De claris mulieribus* or Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*, Semiramis continues to be an important figure and the manner in which she is presented in these catalogues can tell us a great deal about the compiler's attitude towards such viragos.[4] Generally, Semiramis is portrayed in both ancient and medieval catalogues either as a lustful, libidinous woman whose lovers come to an unhappy end or as a builder and ruler; sometimes she appears in both roles simultaneously.[5] The *Fabulae* of Hyginus provides us with a good instance of these two sides to Semiramis. She appears in the work in 4 separate lists: twice in her more public role as builder of one of the seven wonders of the world and a founder of a city, and twice in relation to her private life, as a wife who killed her spouse and a woman who committed suicide.[6]

Semiramis, then, fulfilled a wide variety of roles—as wife, queen, conqueror, builder, innovator, warrior, mother, and lover—and virtually every one of the remaining woman in *DM* resembles the Assyrian queen in one way or another. In fact, Semiramis is such a forceful, dominant figure and her adventures and roles so varied that

---

[1] See Lehmann-Haupt 1910, 678 and Pettinato 1988, 305–308 for further sources.
[2] The bibliography on Semiramis is voluminous; Eilers 1971, Nagel 1982, and Pettinato 1988 are three recent studies which include surveys of earlier work.
[3] See e.g. Julian, *Or.* 3. 127a; Theon *Progymnasmata* 9 (Spengel ii, 114–115); Plutarch *Mor.* 243c; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 64. 2; Dio Cassius 79. 23.
[4] See McLeod 1991, 66 and 125–126.
[5] See Macdonald 1987b on the parallel instance of Boadicea, who is usually presented either as a warrior or a mother.
[6] Hyginus *Fab.* 223. 6; 275. 7; 240. 2; 243. 8 respectively.

she casts a shadow upon the lives of other heroines. Several of the women in *DM*—the disguised Atossa, Babylonian builder Nitocris, and warlike Rhodogyne—engage in activities which are similar to, confused, or even conflated with those of Semiramis and all these women may simply be variations on the original Assyrian queen.[7]

Ctesias, Diodorus, and ADM

Semiramis' popularity in the ancient world must be due, in part, to ADM's source here, Ctesias himself. The version of Assyrian history recorded by Ctesias in his *Persica* became the "vulgate" tradition and was often used as a basis by later Greek and Roman historians who wrote universal histories.[8] No matter that Berossus, the third century BC Babylonian who wrote a history of his country in Greek, will criticize Greek writers for crediting Semiramis with the foundation of Babylon and falsely assigning its many wonders to her; it was Ctesias' account which took hold.[9] Ctesias' original *Persica* is not extant, but considerable fragments of the work remain, providing us with a relatively lucid picture of the historian, his scope, methods, and style. Ctesias devotes the first 6 books of his *Persica* to the pre-Persian empires, beginning with the Assyrians. Ninus is the first king he describes—not, he tells us, because Ninus was the earliest Assyrian king, but because he was the first to achieve great deeds—and the first two books of the *Persica* are dedicated to Ninus and Semiramis. This section of the *Persica* was summarized in considerable detail by Diodorus Siculus. While it has been argued that Diodorus was acquainted with Ctesias only through an intermediary, it is now generally accepted that he consulted the *Persica* directly.[10]

Diodorus' lengthy, leisurely précis of these two books—although selective—makes it clear that Ctesias includes a wealth of informa-

---

[7] See on Nitocris Bab., p. 107.

[8] Drews 1965.

[9] *FGrH* 680 F8; cf. F5. 25 where Berossus assigns Semiramis a date much later than that found in Ctesias. See Burstein 1978, 8; Drews 1965, 130.

[10] Goossens 1940, esp. 39–44 contends that there was a Hellenistic intermediary; see Drews 1973, 195 n. 32. Bigwood 1980, who argues for the direct use of Ctesias by Diodorus, demonstrates that Diodorus provides a great deal of information about the original *Persica*, even while adapting the material in his own style. See too Boncquet 1987 who provides a running historical commentary on Diodorus' summary of Ctesias (Diod. 2. 1–34).

tion, both "factual" and picturesque on the queen.[11] There is little doubt that Ctesias simply invents a great many of the details he supplies, but he may be using older traditions in his *Persica* as well.[12] The tale of Semiramis originated in Mesopotamia, although none of her legend survives in cuneiform writings.[13] Thus ADM, assuming that he read the original *Persica*, was confronted with a vast amount of material—historical, mythical, and novellistic—on one of the most colorful and bold women rulers of antiquity. Yet our notice is remarkable for its encyclopedic tone and methodical arrangement of the bare, biographical data. ADM has boiled down the dramatic and sensational account of Ctesias largely into a series of facts and figures. We learn of Semiramis' ancestry, guardian, husbands, children, and even the exact number of years she lived and ruled, but all these biographical details leave little room in our notice for Semiramis' actual exploits, other than a brief reference to her building activities. We hear nothing of Onnes' suicide, nothing of the Indian king and mock elephants, and nothing of the discarded lovers whom the queen regularly put to death. (We shall return to these various adventures below.) The only hint of drama is found in the description of Semiramis' end: we learn that the queen did not die of ripe old age, but was conspired against by her son.

Whatever the purpose behind our collection of notable women, this reduction of the varied exploits of the colorful and powerful queen almost entirely to a series of names, dates, and straightforward facts is notable. Perhaps it is because Semiramis and her far-flung adventures were so well-known, not to say notorious,[14] that ADM preferred a no-nonsense, matter of fact outline here: our notice may be an instance of the prosaic presentation deliberately used by compilers of paradoxographical catalogues.[15] Or perhaps—if Diodorus

---

[11] Diodorus' summary of Books 1 and 2 is some 36 pages in the Teubner text and Drews (1973, 109) suggests that Ctesias' original account was about 20 times longer. Diodorus does not, of course, include every single incident found in the original *Persica*: there is nothing, for instance, on the conspiracy of Semiramis' two older sons against their mother recorded by Nicolaus (*FGrH* 90 F1); cf. Bigwood 1980, 198.

[12] For two very different views of the amount of genuine tradition vs. invention to be found in Ctesias, see Momigliano 1969 and Jacoby 1922.

[13] See Grayson 1982, 243–244 who suggests that there may have been a written Aramaic account of the Semiramis legend.

[14] Cf. e.g. τὴν ἐπιφανεστάτην ἁπασῶν τῶν γυναικῶν ὧν παρειλήφαμεν Ctesias-Diodorus *FGrH* 688 F1b. 4. 1; Σεμίραμις ἡ διαβόητος Syncellus 688 F1i.

[15] See above, p. 38.

accurately reflects the order of presentation in the *Persica*—ADM carefully read the beginning of Semiramis' tale, telling of her birth, childhood, marriage, and acquaintance with Ninus, then skimmed through the lengthy description of her building feats and military campaigns, and finally recorded the length of the queen's life and rule at the end of his account, just as Diodorus does. It is noteworthy that the only activities of Semiramis which ADM describes—after telling of the events at Barca which lead to her meeting with Ninus, and before relating the circumstances of her death—are those related to her fortifying Babylon and building a temple for Bel (cf. ἐτείχισε τὴν Βαβυλῶνα . . . καὶ τὸ τοῦ Βήλου ἱερὸν κατεσκεύασεν). Interestingly, Herodotus, when promising to tell more about Babylonian rulers in his *Assyrioi Logoi*, specifically refers to these two spheres of activity, saying that he will tell of kings who have embellished the city and its temples (οἳ τὰ τείχεά τε ἐπεκόσμησαν καὶ τὰ ἱρά Hdt. 1. 184). Such accomplishments are precisely those which are often recorded in Neo-Babylonian inscriptions.[16] The divinely sanctioned rebuilding of sanctuaries at Babylon served as a symbolic seal of approval on a new conqueror, legitimizing his rule.[17]

Sammuramat

Before examining Ctesias' account of Semiramis in detail, let us look briefly at the historical Assyrian queen Sammuramat, who is often thought to be the figure behind—or inspiration for—Ctesias' legendary queen, even though over a thousand years separate the two women. We can assign the Semiramis of the *Persica* a date by calculating backwards, from Cyrus' conquest of the Medes. Ctesias allots 1300 years between Ninus and Semiramis, and Sardanapallus, the last of the Assyrian kings, who was overthrown by Arbaces and the Medes. The Median empire, according to the author of the *Persica*, lasted for 317 years, until Cyrus rose to power.[18] Cyrus conquered the Medes in 549 BC, which means that according to Ctesias' "reckoning", Semiramis and the founding of the Assyrian empire should be dated around 2166 BC.[19] The Assyrian queen Sammuramat was the wife of Shamshi-

[16] MacGinnis 1986, 83.
[17] Kuhrt 1990, 127.
[18] *FGrH* 688 F1b 28. 2, F5. 32–34.
[19] See Drews 1965, 130 and 141. He argues (138–142) that Ctesias used Babylonian records for these statements on the duration of Assyrian rule; cf. Goossens 1940, 36–38 for a similar claim.

Adad V (823–810) and mother of Adad-nirari III (809–782), i.e. was active towards the end of the ninth century BC.

Sammuramat was, apparently, a powerful and influential queen and from the time of the earliest Assyriologists onwards, she has been widely identified as the real-life Semiramis, the historical figure to whom legends were subsequently attached.[20] Three cuneiform sources attest to the importance of this queen and queen mother, who *may* have been of Babylonian origin. (1) The governor of Calah dedicated two statues to the god Nabu which were inscribed for the life of the king Adad-nirari and his mother Sammuramat. A mention of the queen mother in this context is unusual.[21] (2) At Ashur there is a memorial stele of Sammuramat. This is not without parallel, for there are other stelae with inscriptions of women in the vicinity.[22] (3) An inscription, the Pazarcik stele, which deals with military affairs and a border dispute mentions Sammuramat immediately after her son.[23] This last item is the strongest indication that the queen may have played an active role in the affairs of the kingdom. Scholars once thought that Sammuramat actually ruled independently or acted as a regent for her son, who supposedly was a minor when his father died, but it has been demonstrated that this hypothesis—which rests upon a mistaken reading of one line of the cuneiform Saba'a stele—has no factual basis.[24] There is no evidence that queens in Assyria ever ruled on their own or served as regents for their children and Sammuramat does not appear in Assyrian king lists. In other words, the historical Assyrian queen Sammuramat was an influential figure, but she certainly was less independent and powerful than Semiramis of the *Persica*. Is Ctesias' queen based, in fact, on Sammuramat? We cannot be certain, for "legend has arrayed this woman with a brilliance which dazzles the eyes."[25]

---

[20] Baumgartner 1959, 300 n. 1 lists earlier scholars who first identified the two. Burstein 1978, 34 argues—on the basis of *FGrH* 680 F5. 25—that the identification of the historical Sammuramat with the legendary Semiramis dates back to ancient times, to the Babylonian author Berossus.

[21] Luckenbill 1926, §§ 744–745, p. 264; cf. Schramm 1972, 520.

[22] Luckenbill 1926, §§ 730–731, p. 260; cf. Grayson 1982, 274 and Schramm 1972, 519–520.

[23] See Grayson 1982, 272 and 275.

[24] Saba'a stele: Luckenbill 1926, §§ 732–737, esp. 734, pp. 260–262; see too Oppenheim in Pritchard 1969, 282. For the correct reading of the line and its wider implications, see Tadmor 1973, 147 and Schramm 1972.

[25] The quotation is from Grayson 1982, 274 who *does* think that Sammuramat is the figure behind the legendary Semiramis. Pettinato 1988 is a recent, detailed argument in favor of the identification; compare Levine 1973.

Derceto and the divine: fish and doves

It is time to look at the legend itself, as recounted by Ctesias in the *Persica*. ADM generally shies away from divine or mythical women and the Assyrian queen, daughter of a Syrian goddess, is the only partially divine figure found in *DM*. In Ctesias' account, Semiramis' supernatural qualities are evident only in relation to her birth and death: her life begins and ends in wondrous fashion. Semiramis, we are told, was born in the city of Ascalon in Syria, the daughter of the goddess Derceto and a Syrian mortal. Aphrodite was angered with Derceto and caused her to fall in love with an ordinary Syrian man. Derceto bears him a child, Semiramis, but is then ashamed of her deed and consequently kills the young man, abandons her daughter in a deserted spot, and throws herself into a lake. She subsequently is transformed into a mermaid-like creature with the body of a fish and the head of a woman. The Syrians, Ctesias adds, henceforth abstain from eating fish, honoring them as gods.[26] Xanthus the Lydian has a variation on this tale (*FGrH* 765 F17) which predates the *Persica*, so that it is clear that Ctesias did not invent the story.[27]

Derceto's name is thought to be based on a Semitic root and means, apparently, "ruler of the sea". If Derceto is connected to the sea and fish, her daughter Semiramis is linked to the heavens and doves. Her name has been interpreted, again in Semitic terms, as "mistress of the high heavens."[28] Ctesias himself uses a "Syrian" etymology to explain the name Semiramis and states that the queen's name means "dove" for it is doves who keep the abandoned baby child warm with their wings and feed her by letting drops of milk fall from their beaks into her mouth.[29] Here we encounter a feature often present in myths about founders: they are abandoned in earliest childhood but manage to survive, sometimes with the aid of animals who tend them. This foundling motif is present in ancient tales from a wide variety of cultures: the story of Sargon is one close Mesopotamian

[26] *FGrH* 688 F1b. 4. 2–3; F1e α, β, γ; Tzetzes (F1e γ) mentions another version, according to which Derceto drowns.

[27] See Momigliano 1969, 186–191 who attempts to trace the origins of the Derceto-Semiramis tale.

[28] See Weinfeld 1991, esp. 99–100, who stresses the Syro-Palestinian background of Semiramis and her mother Derceto; cf. Baumgartner 1959, 301 and Boncquet 1987, 49–54.

[29] F1b 4. 6; see e.g. Eilers 1971, 38–40 and Nagel 1982, 79 for other derivations of her name.

parallel.[30] As the infant Semiramis grows, the doves bring her bits of cheese, and shepherds, puzzled by the disappearing cheese, discover the child. Semiramis is then adopted by the leading herdsman, Simmas, and embarks on a more conventional life; there is no further hint of the supernatural until the very end of her days.

The mature Semiramis learns through consulting an oracle of Ammon that she will disappear and be granted immortal honor. This will take place, she is told, when her son Ninyas conspires against her. Thus when Semiramis discovers that Ninyas is intriguing against her she smoothes the way for his accession to the throne and then disappears.[31] According to some, Ctesias-Diodorus continues, the queen is transformed into a dove and, surrounded by a flock of birds, flies off. Subsequently Semiramis is, in fact, worshipped as a goddess and her people revere doves as well.[32]

We find the same worshipful attitude towards fish and doves in conjunction with a temple at another Syrian city, Hierapolis. This temple is dedicated to the Syrian goddess, Atargatis,[33] and Derceto is, it seems, simply another name for Atargatis.[34] Semiramis was said to have founded the temple of Atargatis-Derceto at Hierapolis and statues of the queen were placed outside the sanctuary.[35] The Syrian goddess Atargatis is identified with one, two, or all three of the great Canaanite goddesses, Astarte, Anat and Asherah,[36] and the Derceto of our tale has qualities in common with at least two of these deities. Thus Derceto is, like the Canaanite Asherah, associated with the sea,[37] while in her romantic affairs she reminds us of Astarte, the goddess of love, war, and fertility. Astarte is frequently identified with Aphrodite, while in the *Persica* Derceto is distinct from—but closely linked to—Aphrodite, who is the agency of her downfall. Doves, the creatures responsible for Semiramis' miraculous upbringing are associated with the cult of the Greek goddess

---

[30] See Lewis 1980, esp. 152–210 who collects some 72 tales of heroes who were exposed at birth. Drews 1974, 388 notes the similarities between the tales of Sargon and Semiramis. Moses and Cyrus are two other such leaders.

[31] Or, perhaps, kills herself? The Greek reads ἠφάνισεν ἑαυτήν (F1b 20. 1).

[32] *FGrH* 688 F1b 14. 3; 20. 1–2; F1m.

[33] Cf. Oden 1977, 55–58.

[34] Strabo 16. 4. 27 = *FGrH* 688 F1d; See too Pliny *Nat.* 5. 81 and the further references in Oden 1977, 69–70; Boncquet 1987, 49–51.

[35] Lucian, *De Syria Dea* 14, 39, 40; cf. 33.

[36] Oden 1977, 73–107.

[37] Oden 1977, 72 and 89.

Aphrodite[38] and our story takes place in Ascalon, which the Greeks knew as the site of the oldest temple of Aphrodite (Hdt. 1. 105). Thus Semiramis' legendary birth and death seem firmly rooted in Syrian traditions.[39] One scholar even attempts to fit Simmas, Semiramis' mortal guardian, into this world of Semitic goddesses and argues that Simmas stems from a goddess named Simia (or possibly her male counterpart Simios).[40]

The spirit of a Babylonian goddess, Ishtar, also hovers over our tale.[41] Ishtar, the goddess of love and war, is sometimes represented as a dove. She also kills her lovers, as do both Derceto and Semiramis. Derceto does away with the unnamed Syrian who fathers her child, while Semiramis is not directly responsible for the death of Onnes, the father of her two older sons, but does, later in life, regularly put her lovers to death.[42] Semiramis also resembles her divine mother Derceto in her unhappy relations with her children: she does not expose any of them, but all three of her sons attempt at various times to kill her.

The Ninus romance

It is curious how the fierce Ishtar-like females described by Ctesias are utterly transformed in a later account of Semiramis, the so-called Ninus romance.[43] In this first century BC work, the earliest sample of a Greek novel, Ninus and Semiramis are a pair of star-crossed lovers, too young to be married legally. The grim goddess Derceto has become the kindly Derceia, and she is anxious to smooth the way for her daughter's romance with Ninus who is, in this version, her nephew.[44] Semiramis herself is a weeping, tongue-tied girl of 13,

---

[38] See e.g. Aelian *NA* 4. 2; Oden 1977, 80–81, 102–104.

[39] For other theories on Semiramis' origins—Babylonian, Armenian etc.—see Pettinato 1988, 45–57.

[40] See Oden 1977, 119; Boncquet 1987, 57 and cf. Lehmann-Haupt 1910, 694.

[41] See Braun 1938, 7 on the "cultural syncretism of the Syrian-Mesopotamian peoples within the Persian empire" and cf. Eilers 1971, 25–29.

[42] Cf. Braun 1938, 7; Perry 1967, 165; Weinfeld 1991, 100; Anderson 1984, 200. In other versions of her tale, Semiramis arranges the death of Ninus as well; see below.

[43] Stephens and Winkler 1995, 23–71 is a convenient edition—with text, translation, and commentary—of the 4 fragments of the Ninus Romance, A, B, C, and D, that have come to light so far.

[44] Perry 1967, 166 sarcastically calls her "Aunt Dercy".

unused to life outside the women's quarters and too shy even to address her aunt, Derceia's sister Thambe and the mother of Ninus in this fragmentary novel. Ninus is an upstanding youth, a far cry from the tyrant of the *Persica* who ruthlessly steals away his lieutenant's wife. The Ninus romance has been interpreted in various ways: as a work addressed by an obscure Greek romancer to an audience of juvenile readers or, alternatively, as a sophisticated portrait of the two contradictory faces, innocent lover and virago, of Semiramis.[45] Perhaps the most telling observation is that these heroic, mythological figures have been rationalized and humanized, but also trivialized.[46] Whatever the literary merits of this early novel, it is worth noting just how much Ctesias' Assyrian queen has changed. The blushing young heroine of the Ninus romance would certainly not be a suitable candidate for inclusion in our collection of warrior women.

Ninus himself was, it seems, a popular figure in romances of this kind.[47] This is unexpected, considering that the Assyrian king Ninus is at first simply a name, an eponymous hero invented by the Greeks to account for the founding of the city of Nineveh and the Assyrian empire. Both Ninus and Nineveh are Νίνος in Greek, but ὁ and ἡ Νίνος respectively.[48] Ninus has no independent life and adventures, other than being the eponymous founder of Nineveh—and, later on, the husband of Semiramis—and he does not appear outside of Greek sources: there is no trace of him in Assyrian king lists. Scholars nonetheless attempt to link Ninus with various historical Assyrian kings who appear on these lists, but no convincing candidate has emerged.[49]

Ninus is even said to be a descendant of Heracles. According to Herodotus, Ninus is the son of Belus—a figure generally identified with Bel-Marduk—who is, in turn, the son of Alcaeus, one of the Heraclidae.[50] Ninus' son Agron is, in Herodotus' account, the founder of a dynasty in Lydia, ruling there until Gyges and his descendants

---

45 See Perry 1967, 164–166 vs. Anderson 1984, 93–94.

46 Braun 1938, 10–11.

47 Cf. Lucian *Pseudolog.* 25; Braun 1938, 5.

48 Drews 1970, 185 n. 12.

49 See Baumgartner 1959, 328; Drews 1965, 137 n. 39 and 142; Boncquet 1987, 45–47. Lewy 1952, 266–270 argues that Ctesias' Ninus has features of two historical rulers: Sammuramat's husband, Shamshi-Adad V and Sennacherib, who fortified Nineveh more than a century later.

50 Hdt. 1. 7; cf. 2. 150.

take over.[51] Ctesias seems to have been the first to have the Assyrian king Ninus of Nineveh marry Semiramis, the builder of Babylon, and link these two figures.[52] Braun points out that while Assyria and Babylonia were often confused by the early Greeks and thought of as one entity, they were in fact constantly at war, and could have become allied together in legend only when both were under Persian domination. Ninus, he adds, is a much more nebulous figure than his wife: he is overshadowed by Semiramis, just as the historical Assyria was in a sense overshadowed by Babylonia, for Nineveh lay in ruins from 612 onwards, while Babylon continued to exist long afterwards.[53]

Onnes, Ninus, and the capture of Bactra

Let us return to Ctesias' story, in itself quite a novellistic tale. Young Semiramis has been adopted by the childless Simmas, the keeper of the king's herds. She is already extraordinarily lovely as an infant and as a beautiful young woman she attracts the attention of Onnes, the king's governor in Syria. (Here, as elsewhere, ADM ignores the physical appearance of the women he describes.) Onnes receives Simmas' permission to wed Semiramis and the young couple go to live in Nineveh, where she bears him two sons. Semiramis proves to be as able as she is beautiful and Onnes, Ctesias tells us, is a great success thanks to her. Onnes leaves Nineveh and joins Ninus in his attempt to capture Bactra, a city which the Assyrian king has tried unsuccessfully to conquer for a long time. There is a prolonged siege of the city, and Onnes, who greatly misses his wife (cf. ὁ τῆς Σεμιράμιδος ἀνὴρ ἐρωτικῶς ἔχων πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα F1b 6. 5) sends for her. She, we are told, realizes that this will be an ideal opportunity to exhibit her intelligence and courage and interprets Onnes' summons as if it were a bid for military assistance, rather than a marital reunion. Here for the very first time, we encounter Semiramis not simply as the daughter of Derceto, ward of Simmas, or wife of Onnes, but as an individual in her own right. She carefully equips herself for the journey, devising a new kind of garment which makes it

[51] See Momigliano 1969, 190–193 and Kuhrt 1987, 540, who notes that it is not clear precisely when Ninus was "knitted into" the genealogy of the Heraclidae.
[52] Cf. Drews 1973, 108–109.
[53] Braun 1938, 8–9.

impossible to discern the gender of the wearer. This form of clothing, we are told (F1b 6. 6), was so attractive and comfortable that it was eventually adopted by the Medes and, later, the Persians as their regular form of attire. While Ctesias' words here may be intended to explain away Median clothing which the Greeks regarded as rather effeminate, the specially designed garment can be perceived as an attempt by Semiramis to hide her sexual identity. In other versions of her tale, the Assyrian queen does, in fact, introduce new clothing in order to mask her identity as a woman. We shall see that another ruler in *DM*, Atossa, also uses innovative clothing to hide the fact that she is female and Atossa is often identified (or confused) with Semiramis.[54] But perhaps the point of Semiramis' unisex dress is that she is a liminal figure of indeterminate gender, partially male and partially female. When she arrives in Bactra, she outstrips the men in the very masculine domain of war, for she succeeds in subduing the Bactrians, where both Ninus and his lieutenant Onnes have failed. She observes that the forces guarding the city's acropolis often leave their posts to aid their fellow soldiers lower down and consequently manages to seize the citadel, bringing about the city's downfall.[55]

Ninus admires Semiramis' courage, her male side, as it were, and rewards her with great gifts; he then is attracted to her as a woman as well (cf. διὰ τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἀνθρώπου σχὼν ἐρωτικῶς F1b 6. 8) and tries to persuade Onnes to relinquish his wife. The Assyrian king even offers his daughter to his lieutenant in exchange for Semiramis, but the unfortunate Onnes refuses. When Ninus threatens to blind him, Onnes hangs himself.[56] In this fashion Semiramis becomes Ninus' wife, the queen of Assyria.

There is an historical Assyrian parallel to this tale of a king stealing his lieutenant's wife. A letter (of unknown date) tells of a revolt in Assyria led by an official because the king has taken his wife into the harem.[57] Another parallel which comes to mind is the biblical

---

[54] Cf. Claudian *In Eutropium* 1. 339–42 and on Atossa, p. 141.

[55] In later sources—Cephalion *FGrH* 93 F1; Justin 1. 1. 9; Theon, *Progymnasmata* 9 (Spengel ii, 115)—we are told that the "magus" Zoroaster is the king of Bactra whom Semiramis defeats, but Ctesias calls the king Ὀξυάρτης (F1b 6. 2); cf. Boncquet 1987, 65–68.

[56] Blinding often symbolizes castration in Greek eyes—cf. Devereux 1973, 43—so that Ninus may actually be threatening to castrate Onnes here.

[57] See Campbell Thompson 1937.

tale of David, Bathsheba, and Uriah. In none of these three accounts do we hear of the woman's reaction to her change of partner. Ctesias may have made the most of his melodramatic tale and allowed all three participants in this romantic triangle to have their say, but while we sense Ninus' increasing impatience and hear of Onnes' fear, frenzy, and passion, there is no trace of Semiramis' feelings in the summary provided by Diodorus. Did Ctesias present her point of view? Later on she will ruthlessly kill off her discarded lovers, but here we do not know if Semiramis wished to leave Onnes and marry the most powerful man in Assyria or if she was loyal to her first spouse. In any event, as Ninus' wife (and then widow), Semiramis will eventually become sole ruler of the Assyrian kingdom.

If there are resemblances between Semiramis and other foundlings-turned-rulers such as Cyrus and Sargon (above, p. 70), the queen's later career is substantially different from that of these men, because she is a woman. All three figures are adopted by a kindly figure who serves as a stepping stone on their upward path, but the male heroes then progress because of their superior abilities as gardeners, cup bearers etc.[58] Semiramis wends her way to the throne both by means of her own achievements and through her two marriages. She must enlist all her beauty, charm, intelligence, and military abilities and prove herself in both traditionally female and traditionally male domains, before she becomes the sole ruler of Assyria. In this sense, heavier demands are made upon her than upon Sargon or Cyrus.

Semiramis as courtesan

There is another version as to how Semiramis acquired the throne and in this account she plays a role more commonly associated with women, for she is said to be a courtesan. Diodorus attributes the story to an otherwise unknown historian named Athenaeus, and Deinon, the 4th century BC author of a *Persica* who delights in "correcting" Ctesias, tells virtually the same tale; Plutarch knows of a similar account.[59] In this version Semiramis is a beautiful courtesan whom Ninus eventually marries. She asks the king's permission to sit on the throne and act as ruler for 5 days. Wearing the royal robes,

[58] See Drews 1974, esp. 389–391 and Lewis 1980, 213–214.

[59] Diod. 2. 20. 3–5; De(i)non *FGrH* 690 F7; Plut. *Mor.* 753d–e. See too Pliny *Nat.* 35. 78 for a 4th cent. BC painting of Semiramis the courtesan.

she deposes Ninus in stages, first winning over the Assyrian nobles, then arresting Ninus, and finally having him killed. Commentators suggest that an Assyrian ritual involving a substitute king lies behind this tale, a ritual in which a substitute sits on the king's throne, wears his clothes, and acts as king for a brief period, because an omen predicts the real king's death.[60] Whatever the ritual underlying this version of Semiramis' rise to power, she is quite a different figure from Ctesias' queen, for this heroine uses only traditionally female weapons—beauty, seductiveness, deception, and wiles—in order to become the ruler of Assyria.[61]

Building an empire

Returning to the *Persica*, we find that Ninus is already old when he marries Semiramis and apparently dies soon after fathering their son, Ninyas: Diodorus' summary reads γεννήσας ἐκ Σεμιράμιδος υἱὸν ἐτελεύτησε (F1b 7. 1). Ninus' age at the time of his meeting with Semiramis is, incidentally, the only bit of information which is found exclusively in our notice in *DM* and is not mentioned by Diodorus in his much lengthier summary of the *Persica.* Ninus leaves his kingdom to his wife and the queen's very first act as ruler presages her future career. She buries her husband in the palace area and erects a huge mound over his grave. The mound, we are told, serves as a landmark which can be seen from a great distance and it survives long after Nineveh itself is destroyed. The mound erected by Semiramis, the first of her great construction works, is not simply a tribute to her husband: she uses his very bones to embellish the city and turns his monument into a symbol of her power and strength. Ctesias' queen will continue to build a great many mounds—as tombs for her generals who die, as foundations for various cities, and as surveying points while on military campaigns. She is even said to bury her former lovers alive in such mounds, pretending that these heaps are meant to control floods.[62]

---

[60] See Drews 1974, 389–390 and Pettinato 1988, 91–94, who also mentions in this context the Babylonian festival called Sacaea. At the Sacaea, according to Berossus (*FGrH* 680 F2), slaves exchange places with their masters for five days and one slave wears the king's robe and rules in his stead; cf. Strabo 11. 8. 5.

[61] In one source (Macrobius *Comm. in somn. Scip.* 2. 10. 7), Semiramis is said to be Ninus' *daughter* and she presumably inherits the throne from her father.

[62] Cf. *FGrH* 688 F1b 14.1–2; F1i.

From the start, the queen, we are told, is eager to outdo her predecessor on the throne and many of her projects and conquests are modeled upon those of Ninus and meant to rival them.[63] If Ninus founded Nineveh to be the greatest city of all, Semiramis is similarly ambitious in relation to the city she founds, Babylon. While we hear very little of Ninus' Nineveh, which Ctesias mistakenly locates on the banks of the Euphrates, rather than the Tigris, Semiramis' building feats in Babylon are described at considerable length, with a great many precise—but incredible—facts and figures.[64] The author of the *Persica* tells of the walls of Babylon and its towers; the bridge over the Euphrates and the piers, cutwaters, and quays along the banks of the river; the pair of palaces, one on each side of the river and the hidden underground passage connecting the two; the temple or ziggurat of Zeus-Belus with its golden statues, tables, cups, and bowls. Ctesias probably attributed the famed Hanging Gardens of Babylon to Semiramis as well, for Diodorus takes pains to explain that they were the work of a later king.[65]

Ctesias in Babylon

It is likely that Ctesias visited Babylon: archaeological excavations of the city indicate that the author of the *Persica* described, if at times inaccurately or in exaggerated fashion, what he saw at the Babylon of his time.[66] Ctesias then ascribed the architectural marvels of Babylon to his heroine Semiramis. One item described by Ctesias has raised considerable interest: a hunting scene featuring colorful animals found on the walls of the greater of the two palaces. In this decorative scene, Semiramis is said to be on horseback throwing a javelin at a leopard, while Ninus thrusts a spear into a lion (*FGrH* 688 F1b 8. 6). Multi-colored glazed brick animals have actually been found near this great palace and excavators have uncovered a fragment of glazed

---

[63] Compare Ninus' concern that none of his successors should find it easy to surpass him (μηδὲ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων ἕτερον ἐπιβαλόμενον ῥᾳδίως ἂν ὑπερθέσθαι F1b 3. 1) with Semiramis' desire to do precisely that (φιλοτιμουμένη τῇ δόξῃ τὸν βεβασιλευκότα πρὸ αὐτῆς ὑπερθέσθαι F1b 7. 2). This attempt to equal or surpass a predecessor is a regular feature of Babylonian kingship—cf. e.g. Kuhrt 1990, 127–128.

[64] For more on the building of Babylon, see below on Nitocris Bab., p. 112.

[65] Diod. 2. 10. 1; cf. Curt. Ruf. 5. 1. 35 and see Bigwood 1978, 45 n. 11 and 47 n. 23.

[66] See Bigwood 1978 for a thorough examination of the question and cf. Boncquet 1987, 71 ff.

brick with what was thought to be a white, female face—the face of Semiramis from Ctesias' hunt scene! This was then taken as an indication that the Achaemenid ruler who built the palace which Ctesias saw at Babylon was acquainted with the tale of Ninus and Semiramis, which would mean, in turn, that the physician from Cnidus had heard his Assyrian history from the Persians.[67] It is now believed that the white face is that of a male, and there is no archaeological evidence for Ctesias' hunt scene.[68] Nonetheless, the supposed frieze is interesting because of the equal roles allotted to Ninus and Semiramis: the king hunts a lion and the queen a leopard. (Aelian claims that Semiramis, in fact, did not consider either a leopard or a lion serious prey and only bothered going after lionesses, the most dangerous adversary of all.)[69]

Semiramis and Behistun

We find the Assyrian king and his wife again commemorated as equals in the bronze statues the queen is said to have erected at her second, lesser palace in Babylon (F1b 8. 7). In this palace there were statues of Ninus and Semiramis and their subordinates, as well as one of Zeus-Belus (i.e. Bel-Marduk). Later, having established perhaps that she was the peer of her husband and predecessor on the throne, Semiramis will not include Ninus. At Bagistanus (Behistun) she engraves a likeness of herself, surrounded by a hundred spearmen, and adds an inscription, commemorating her deed; Ninus does not appear at all (F1b 13. 2). Here the author of the *Persica* is apparently presenting a garbled description of Darius' inscription and relief at Behistun.[70] Polyaenus, in his very curious notice on Semiramis (8. 26),[71] includes the text of another inscription allegedly composed by the Assyrian queen. In this *res gestae*, Polyaenus' Semiramis begins by declaring that she, born a woman, is the equal of noble men in her deeds: the inscription itself is meant to establish her claim. After

---

[67] Cf. Goossens 1940, 29–30.

[68] Cf. Bigwood 1978, 42–43 with notes and further references on 51–52.

[69] Aelian *VH* 12. 39; Bigwood 1978, 51 n. 80 thinks he was influenced by Ctesias.

[70] Ctesias is the only Greek author—other than Isidore of Charax—who mentions the Behistun monument; see Boncquet 1987, 101–102. Phillips 1968 suggests that Ctesias is describing an earlier rock sculpture at Behistun which is related to the pre-Aryan Kassite goddess, Shimaliya. Shimaliya, he contends, was later absorbed into the figure of Semiramis.

[71] See below on Rhodogyne, p. 155.

listing the boundaries of her extended empire, the Assyrian queen dwells on her engineering feats on land and water, and stresses the agricultural benefits brought about by changing the course of rivers. Despite her many labors, Semiramis concludes, she found time to please herself and her friends. The tone of this inscription, which is written in the first person, is—like Darius' Behistun inscription—personal and vivid.[72] All of the queen's accomplishments in the inscription recorded by Polyaenus correspond to her actions in the *Persica* and it is possible that Ctesias' complete Behistun inscription, which is only summarized by Diodorus, is what underlies Polyaenus' text.

Ctesias devotes a great deal more space to Semiramis' deeds. We hear of an obelisk the queen brings to Babylon from Armenia, one of the seven wonders of the world, of a park and buildings at the Median city of Chauon, of construction works and a palace at Ecbatana, and of various conquests and building projects in Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia. We have already seen that she also consults an oracle at Ammon (*FGrH* 688 F1b 11. 4–5, 13–14). There are several parallels between Ninus' movements and conquests as outlined by Ctesias and those of Semiramis and perhaps here too the queen attempts to match her husband's accomplishments.[73] Semiramis' legendary campaigns in Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia are also thought to be modeled upon those of Herodotus' Cambyses.[74] Some scholars find historical traces in this section of the *Persica.* Thus the boundaries of Ninus' empire correspond with the limits of Artaxerxes' empire in Ctesias' time[75] and the Assyrian king's Armenian campaign, described both in the *Persica* and the Ninus romance, may reflect actual Assyrian concerns.[76]

Alexander and Semiramis

Most interesting of all are the parallels between Semiramis' alleged activities and the actual deeds of Alexander the Great. Both rulers conquer Egypt, Media, and Bactria, both visit the oracle at Ammon, and both attempt to subjugate India.[77] Alexander, in fact, is said to

---

[72] Compare the inscription composed by the Babylonian Nitocris, below p. 114.
[73] Cf. von Gutschmid 1890, 160–161.
[74] Braun 1938, 16–17.
[75] Goossens 1940, 26 with n. 4; Drews 1973, 195 n. 32.
[76] Braun 1938, 12; Perry 1967, 164 and 356 n. 9.
[77] Eddy 1961, 122–124; Goossens 1940, 40–41; Sack 1991, 78–80, 107–108.

be eager to capture India precisely because two earlier great conquerors—Semiramis and Cyrus—had failed to do so.[78] Here, it is worth noting, Alexander apparently views the legendary Assyrian queen as an historical figure, the equal of Cyrus the Great, and strives to outdo them both.

The Indian campaign

India was Semiramis' one failure and Ctesias has a lengthy, unconvincing account of the queen's Indian campaign, an account which was doubted even in antiquity.[79] Diodorus' summary presents Semiramis' military defeat in moralistic terms: the hybristic, overly successful leader finally meets her match. The queen, we are told, undertakes the war out of a desire for glory and has no real grievance against the enemy; before going to war she laughs at her enemy's warnings.[80] In the first confrontation between the two armies Semiramis is victorious; elated by her success, she is enticed into constructing a huge bridge and crossing a river and this, in true Herodotean fashion, leads to her downfall.[81] Although she has gathered immense forces for the attack, Semiramis does not rely on sheer numbers and uses deceptive tactics as well. The Assyrian queen, aware of the Indians' successful use of elephants in warfare, devises dummy elephants of her own, made of oxen hides filled with straw: each mock elephant has one man and one camel inside.[82] This clothing of men in animal skins reminds one scholar of the goddess Ishtar, who transforms her discarded lovers into animals.[83] The mock elephants are, in any event, to no avail and at their second engagement the Indian king twice manages to wound the Assyrian queen, who is forced to flee. But Semiramis, who has been promised immortality by the oracle, is not killed by the Indian king, because heaven-sent omens prevent him from pursuing her.

---

[78] Arrian, *Anab.* 6. 24. 2–3; Strabo 15. 1. 5, 15. 2. 5. Eddy 1961, 122–124 contends that it is actually Semiramis who is emulating Alexander here, for he thinks that Diodorus' account of the queen was influenced by Alexander's deeds.

[79] *FGrH* 688 F1b 16. 4–19. 10; Strabo 15. 1. 6; cf. Drews 1973, 109–110.

[80] F1b 16. 1, 4; 18. 1–2.

[81] See on Tomyris, p. 190.

[82] Cf. Suda s.v. Σεμίραμις.

[83] Anderson 1984, 200.

The queen's children

Semiramis' life comes to an end, as we have seen (p. 71), when her son Ninyas conspires against her. The queen apparently had a troubled relationship with all three of her sons. The two older sons, Onnes' children, are persuaded by a eunuch to try to kill their mother, but she hears of the plot. She then confronts her children and mockingly urges them to go ahead with their plan.[84] Ninyas, the queen's son by Ninus, actually brings about his mother's death and he is, Ctesias tells us, as unlike his mother as can be. As Semiramis' successor on the throne, he leads a life among women, avoiding men and warlike activities.[85] Ninyas is a classic example of an Aegisthus figure, a weak man attached to a preternaturally strong woman: in the words of Justin (1. 2. 11), it is almost as if he has changed sex with his mother *veluti sexum cum matre mutasset.*[86] But Ninyas is not altogether weak and he is man enough to end the reign of his mother, the queen. Semiramis' son reminds us of Ctesias' last Assyrian king, Sardanapallus, who spends his life in the harem spinning wool, but fights boldly when his kingdom is threatened.[87]

Sexual voracity

According to Justin (1. 2. 10), Ninyas kills his mother because she wants to have sexual relations with him. Sexual voracity is a feature often associated with warrior women: their anomalous or marginal position in society leaves them particularly liable to accusations of sexual misconduct. This is true of widows as well.[88] Thus we find the widowed, powerful Assyrian queen condemned for her sexual behavior in the *Persica* itself. The eunuch who urges Semiramis' older sons to kill their mother points out that it is shameful for them to

---

[84] Nicolaus *FGrH* 90 F1. For Nicolaus' dependence on Ctesias here, see e.g. Drews 1973, 104 with n. 32 and the further bibliography there; cf. below on Zarinaea, p. 92.

[85] *FGrH* 688 F1b 21. 1–2; F1n; compare Plato's description of the upbringing given the children of Cyrus the Great (*Laws* 694c–695b).

[86] Cf. Hall 1989, 208–209.

[87] F1b 23–27; F1p; F1q. Hellanicus apparently finds this so difficult to believe that he turns Sardanapallus into two distinct kings—*FGrH* 4 F63; see Kuhrt 1987, 542.

[88] See Macdonald 1987b, 41 and compare Buitelaar 1995, 8–9 and 14 (on widows); both base their analyses on the earlier work of Douglas 1966, esp. 38–40, 94–104. See too Ardener 1978, esp. 40–43 and Fraser 1988, 11.

allow her, an older woman, to carry on with younger men. When Semiramis' enemy, the Indian king, condemns the queen for attacking his country, he accuses her of reprehensible sexual behavior as well as unprovoked aggression.[89] Later writers have the queen mate with a horse and then commit suicide by leaping, Dido-fashion, into a pyre.[90]

Such lurid stories have little to do with the real character of Ctesias' Assyrian queen: perhaps her greatest sexual misdemeanor was that she did not permit personal relationships to outweigh other concerns. We have already seen that Semiramis does not allow her lovers—who are carefully selected on the basis of their appearance—to remain alive and Ctesias specifically says that she does not remarry for fear of losing her throne (F1b 13. 4; cf. F1i). It seems, then, that the queen's sexual behavior is not ungovernable, but determined by political considerations. She was, as far as we can tell, a good wife both to Onnes and to Ninus, probably because it was to her advantage to be so. She was an even better widow, becoming a queen upon the death of her first husband, and the outstanding ruler of an empire when her second spouse died. It is no wonder that this vigorous, ambitious queen casts her shadow upon so many of the other women found in *DM*.

---

[89] *FGrH* 90 F1; 688 F1b 18. 1; cf. F1m where the queen is termed λάγνος γυνὴ καὶ μιαιφόνος.

[90] Pliny *Nat.* 8. 155 with Hyginus *Fab.* 243. 8; cf. Baumgartner 1959, 303 n. 3. In Indian traditions, a horse often is linked to kingship and there is a Vedic ritual where the queen lies with a horse which has been killed—see Burkert 1983, 16 n. 21 and 69–70 n. 51.

Zarinaea

Sources: Ctesias *Persica: FGrH* 688 F5 = Diodorus Siculus 2. 34. 1–5; *FGrH* 688 F7 = *DM* 2; *FGrH* 688 F8a = Demetrius *De elocutione* 213; *FGrH* 688 F8b = *P. Oxy.* 2330.
Related Sources: Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F5; Tzetzes *Chiliades* 12. 893–898; cf. Suda s.v. Στρυγγαῖος.

ADM and Diodorus Siculus

Zarinaea, like Semiramis, appeared in Ctesias' *Persica* and we possess a particularly wide range of fragments from that work dealing with the Sacian queen. At the same time, our brief notice in *DM* is quite valuable for it provides several items of unique information and raises some interesting questions. ADM concentrates on one particular incident in Zarinaea's life—her participation in the battle waged between the Medes and the Sacae over the control of Parthia and its subsequent ramifications—and he surveys the various men in her life as well. Other sources emphasize different aspects of the queen's rule. It is particularly illuminating to compare our notice with the summary supplied by Diodorus Siculus for this section of the *Persica* (F5. 34. 1–5). Zarinaea,[1] Diodorus tells us, is exceptionally beautiful and accomplished. She is ambitious in war and bravest in daring and deed among the Sacian women, for the bold Sacian women, Diodorus notes, share the dangers of war with their men folk. Zarinaea conquers neighboring rebellious tribes, civilizes the land, founds cities, and generally makes her fellow-countrymen very happy. When she dies, Zarinaea's grateful subjects build her a huge monument in the shape of a pyramid, with a golden statue of the queen on the top.[2] Diodorus' sketch of the Sacian queen includes a great many clichés—she is clever, beautiful, courageous etc.—and in broad outline Zarinaea is not unlike another Ctesian queen whom Diodorus describes,

[1] Our sources preserve a variety of forms for the queen's name. Diodorus uses her name only once and calls her Ζαρίνα (2. 34. 3), while *P. Oxy.* 2330 has Ζαρειεαίαν in lines 4–5, which is then corrected to Ζαρειναίαν. Nicolaus uses Ζαριναία (as in *DM*) and this is the form favored by scholars—cf. Jacoby's critical apparatus at *FGrH* 688 F 5. 34. 3; Schmitt 1979, 121 n. 15.

[2] Compare the golden statue Darius constructs, depicting his favorite wife, Artystone (Hdt. 7. 69. 2) and see Brosius 1996, 84–85 with n. 2. See too on Rhodogyne, p. 156.

Semiramis.[3] She is also reminiscent of the anonymous Amazon queen depicted by Diodorus at 2. 46, who conquers, builds temples, and is loved by her subjects.[4] There is very little overlap between Diodorus' rather general account and our notice in *DM*, for Diodorus does not mention any of the men in the Zarinaea's life: neither Stryangaeus nor her two husbands appear in his summary and we hear nothing of Mermerus' murder or the queen's tragic love affair with the Mede general. Yet, even if "in Diodorus' hands Ctesias' highly colorful narrative has clearly become something rather dull and conventional",[5] Diodorus' portrait of Zarinaea is not without its complexities. On the one hand, the Sacian Zarinaea belongs to a tribe of warrior women and conquers rebellious tribes; on the other, she civilizes or tames (cf. ἐξημερῶσαι F5. 34. 4) most of her land, founds cities, and has well-contented subjects. We shall see that Ctesias' original account of Zarinaea appears to have been similarly intricate.

Sacae and Scythians

Herodotus correctly observes that "Sacae" is the Persian name for all the Scythians (οἱ γὰρ Πέρσαι πάντας τοὺς Σκύθας καλέουσι Σάκας 7. 64. 2), but he himself uses the name to designate only certain Scythian tribes. Modern scholars sometimes use the term Scythian for the ancient inhabitants of the northern coastal region of the Black Sea, reserving the name Sacae for the Scythians of central Asia, but often the Sacae are not distinguished from Scythians and both names are simply used to refer to nomadic peoples of the steppes north of the Danube.[6] Ctesias seems to speak of both Sacae and Scythians,[7] and here too the terms will be used interchangeably.

Sibling marriage

Our notice opens with Zarinaea already a widow. *DM* is our sole authority for Zarinaea's first marriage to her brother Cydraeus, king of the Sacae, and Cydraeus, who is mentioned only here, is otherwise

[3] Compare e.g. Semiramis' beauty (2. 5. 1–2), intelligence and courage (2. 6. 5), ambitions (2. 7. 2), and foundation of cities (2. 11. 1 etc.).
[4] See Casevitz 1985, esp. 119–123 for other powerful women in Diodorus.
[5] Bigwood 1980, 202.
[6] Dandamayev 1979, 96; Cook 1983, 195; cf. Diakonoff 1985, 91–92, 100.
[7] Cf. e.g. *FGrH* 688 F9. 3; F13. 20–21.

unknown.[8] We do not know what role, if any, Cydraeus played in the *Persica*, but here his sole function is to explain Zarinaea's ascent to the throne: like so many of the women of *DM*, she rules because she is the king's widow. In this case, Zarinaea is the king's sister as well and is a member of the royal family in her own right; this makes her accession all the more natural. Lyde and (in all likelihood) the Egyptian Nitocris are two other queens in *DM* who are married to their brothers and there is, perhaps, a relation between rule by women and sister-marriage. Hornblower, when discussing sibling marriage in the ancient world, points out that under Persian influence, a number of Iranian cultures adopted brother-sister marriages, including the Parthians, Zarinaea's allies.[9]

Sacae, Medes, and Parthians: the historical background

The next man in Zarinaea's life is Mermerus, the ruler of the Parthians. Diodorus, in his summary of Ctesias (2. 34. 1), tells us that Parthia was originally a possession of the Median empire,[10] but during the reign of the Mede king Astibaras the Parthians joined ranks with the Sacae and this Parthian-Scythian alliance led to a war between the Sacae and the Medes.[11] The two sides fought continually during Astibaras' reign, Diodorus continues, until Zarinaea intervened. Zarinaea, then, is queen of the Scythians during the reign of Astibaras, the last Median king but one, according to the author of the *Persica*.

Can we relate Ctesias' tale to an historical framework? Median history is a notoriously difficult affair—there are no archaeological remains of Median art, writing, or artifacts—and scholars disagree strongly over the nature of the Median state, its kings, and empire.[12] The list of Median kings—including Astibaras—found in the *Persica*

[8] Heeren 1789, 12 n. 7.

[9] Hornblower 1982, 358–363; cf. Brosius 1996, 45–46 and see on Dido, p. 128.

[10] Cf. Diakonoff 1985, 127–128 with n. 3.

[11] Diodorus uses the form Πάρθοι here for the Parthians (2. 34. 1, 2), although elsewhere in his account (2. 2. 3) we find Παρθυαῖοι as in *DM*. In Photius' summary of Ctesias there is yet a third variation, Πάρθιοι (*FGrH* 688 F9. 8). Such confusion of names is rampant in the Zarinaea episode but these variations must surely be due to the various excerptors of the *Persica*, and not to Ctesias himself—see Schmitt 1979, 121; Bigwood 1986, 405–406.

[12] See e.g. Helm 1981; Young 1988; Brown 1988; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1988b and 1994; Muscarella 1994.

certainly raises difficulties. It differs entirely from the Median rulers mentioned by Herodotus (except for Astyages) and scholars agree that although the names furnished by Ctesias are Median, there is no historical basis whatsoever for his list.[13] Herodotus' account of Median history is often considered by scholars inaccurate as well: his *Medikos logos* has been termed misleading, "with artificial chronology and an unhistorical narrative."[14] In any event, Ctesias' Astibaras is Astyages' predecessor on the Median throne and consequently corresponds to the Cyaxares of Herodotus; Cyaxares' dates are c. 625–585 BC.[15] This means that according to Ctesias' scheme of things, Zarinaea supposedly lived at the beginning of the sixth century.

The story of the Sacian queen is all that Diodorus (and in all likelihood, Ctesias) has to report about the rule of Astibaras. His counterpart in Herodotus, Cyaxares, is similarly embroiled with the Scythians and the war between the Medes and the Scythians described here by Ctesias may correspond to Cyaxares' Scythian war in Herodotus (1. 103–106).[16] (Interestingly the Scythian encounter is almost all there is in Herodotus' *History* about Cyaxares.)[17] Herodotus tells us that the Scythians defeated the Medes and ruled over Asia for some 28 years in the middle of Cyaxares' reign (1. 103–106). Scholars find it difficult to determine the dates of this supposed Scythian interregnum in Media and the very historicity of such a period of Scythian rule cannot be established.[18] We do hear, however, of the Scythians in cuneiform sources: the Scythian king Protothyes, mentioned by Herodotus as the father of Cyaxares' enemy Madyas (Hdt. 1. 103. 3), is probably to be identified with "Bartatua (or Partatua) king of the Scythians" who was an ally of the Assyrians and appears in one of Esarhaddon's omen queries.[19] The Scythians, then, played an important role in the Zagros in the seventh and early sixth century BC and if we accept Herodotus' account of military clashes between the Medes and the Scythians during that period, the general background to Ctesias' tale may well be

---

[13] Jacoby 1922, 2049 and 2055; Drews 1973, 111; Diakonoff 1985, 110 and 142.
[14] Helm 1981, 88; contrast Brown 1988.
[15] Young 1988, 17; Diakonoff 1985, 113; Cook 1983, 4; cf. Helm 1981, 87.
[16] See Gilmore 1888, 107 n.
[17] Cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1994, esp. 49–51.
[18] See e.g. Diakonoff 1985, 112; Cook 1983, 4, 6; Brown 1988, 82, 85.
[19] Starr 1990 no. 20, pp. 24–26; see Helm 1981, 86; Young 1988, 20 n. 60; Diakonoff 1985, 103.

historical.[20] However, the chief figures in our story—Cydraeus, Mermerus, Astibaras, Stryangaeus, and, of course, Zarinaea—are unknown outside of the *Persica* (or later sources dependent upon that work) and there is no evidence that Ctesias' characters ever existed.

Mermerus

Returning to Mermerus, we find that Nicolaus in his adaptation of Ctesias' tale[21] speaks of Μαρμάρεω τοῦ Σακῶν βασιλέως (*FGrH* 90 F5) and Marmares (Μαρμάρης) may have been the original name.[22] Was Ctesias' Mermerus ruler of the Parthians or king of the Sacae? One scholar argues that he was, in fact, both. At first Mermerus was leader of the Parthians, who were under Median rule, but when the Parthians switched their allegiance to the Sacae, he married Zarinaea and became king of the Sacae.[23] If Mermerus did acquire sovereignty over the Sacae when he married Zarinaea, the situation is comparable to Cyrus' attempt to take over the land of the Massagetae by marrying Tomyris.[24] Tomyris, of course, refused Cyrus and one wonders why Zarinaea accepted Mermerus' offer. Her subsequent complicity in her husband's death indicates that she regretted the marriage.

Scythians, Sauromatae, and Amazons

The Scythian-Parthian alliance leads to war with the Medes, according to Ctesias. These Medes are surprisingly enough termed Persians by ADM in our notice (cf. τοῦ δὲ Περσῶν βασιλέως . . . τῷ Πέρσῃ). Normally, of course, the reverse occurs and the Persians are often called Medes.[25] The women of *DM* frequently have some relationship with the Persian king and this may be why ADM confuses the Medes

---

[20] See Young 1988, 20; Frye 1984, 72; Diakonoff 1985, 118–119 etc.

[21] Nicolaus' account here is based very closely on the *Persica*—see e.g. Biltcliffe 1969, 86 with n. 8 and cf. Toher 1989.

[22] Schmitt 1979, 122–123.

[23] Heeren 1789, 11–12 n. 7. Nagel 1982, 47 suggests that Mermerus was the Mede governor of Parthia (which may be why ADM terms Mermerus δυνάστης—rather than βασιλεύς—of the Parthians), who broke away from Astibaras and brought his province as a kind of dowry to Zarinaea.

[24] See on Tomyris, p. 189.

[25] D. F. Graf 1984 and Tuplin 1994 are two recent studies of the Greeks' use of the terms "Mede" and "Persian."

with the Persians here. Zarinaea, in any event, goes to war against the Medes on horseback, much like an Amazon queen and Ctesias himself may have noted this resemblance. Demetrius, when telling of Ctesias' account of the original encounter between Zarinaea and Stryangaeus[26] on the battlefield, adds that Sacian women, like the Amazons go to battle (μάχονται γὰρ δὴ αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν Σάκαις ὥσπερ αἱ Ἀμαζόνες) and Jacoby takes these words to be a direct quotation from the *Persica*.[27] In *his* summary of Ctesias, Diodorus simply describes how the Sacae women participate in the dangers of battle together with their men (γυναῖκας... καὶ κοινωνούσας τοῖς ἀνδράσι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις κινδύνων).[28] Even if Ctesias does not expressly compare the Sacae women to the Amazons, the similarities between these two groups of women warriors who do battle on horseback are apparent. There is, however, one major difference as well: the Sacae women are married and fight alongside their husbands, while the Amazons, of course, do battle on their own.

Amazons were often linked with Sacae or Scythians. One of the traditional locations of the Amazons was in Scythia, considered to be at the very northern edges of the earth[29] and the Amazons were closely associated with Scythians in literature and in art.[30] It has been noted that "fighting a Scythian queen may have formed part of a conventional Iranian repertory of heroic feats, just as fighting against Amazons seems to have been a required task for many Greek heroes."[31] Thus in Herodotus' *History* Cyrus goes to war with Tomyris, a Scythian-like queen, while in Ctesias' *Persica* the same Persian king encounters Sparethra, the Sacian warrior queen on the battlefield, and Zarinaea's confrontation with Stryangaeus is another instance of these Scythian-Iranian encounters.

The presence of such Scythian women warriors in the pages of Herodotus and Ctesias reflects some kind of historical reality, for

---

[26] Here, too, there are various traditions on Stryangaeus' name; τοῦ Ἀγγαίου was the original reading in *DM*. Demetrius (F8a = *De Eloc.* 213) has the name Στρυάγλιος, while the Demetrius-based Tzetzes (*Chiliades* 12. 898) tells of Στρυάλιος—see Finckh 1860. But the Mede general is called Στρυαγγαῖος by Nicolaus of Damascus in his version of Ctesias' tale (*FGrH* 90 F5) and this seems confirmed by the *Persica* papyrus (F8b).

[27] *De eloc.* 213 = *FGrH* 688 F8a; cf. Roberts 1954, 82 n. 2.

[28] *FGrH* 688 F5. 34. 3; compare Tzetzes *Chiliades* 12. 894–897.

[29] Tyrrell 1984, 55–56 with 142 n. 45; cf. Hall 1989, 113–115.

[30] See e.g. Aes. *PV* 415–419; Isoc. *Paneg.* 68 and cf. Hardwick 1990, 18–19; Shapiro 1983; Blok 1994, 92–100.

[31] Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 466.

there is evidence that some Scythian women rode on horseback, used bows and arrows, and went to battle. Archaeological remains indicate that there were female Scythian warriors, chiefly—but not solely—among the Sauromatae, "a nomad steppe people of Iranian stock, kin to the Scyths."[32] Herodotus distinguishes between Scythian and Sauromatae women and describes the Sauromatae as a product of the union between young Scythian men and Amazon women (Hdt. 4. 110–117). He tells us that a group of Amazons who have been captured by the Greeks after the battle at Thermodon kill their captors and come ashore in the land of the Scythians. The Amazons meet up with Scythian young men, mate with them, and then agree to marry them. The Amazon women insist, however, upon removing with their Scythian husbands to a new, uninhabited land, since they are so unlike the Scythian women. They, who know nothing of women's work, use bows and spears and ride horses, while the Scythian women remain in their wagons performing womanly tasks (4. 114. 3).[33] Herodotus relates that the female descendants of this union between the Amazons and the Scythians, the Sauromatae women, continue in the ways of their great grandmothers: they hunt, go to war, and dress as the men do. They are not allowed to marry until they have killed an enemy on the battlefield (Hdt. 4. 117). The roughly contemporary Hippocratic treatise *Airs, Waters, Places* (17) has a similar description of the Sauromatae women.[34] The women ride horseback and go to war as long as they are virgins. They are only allowed to marry after they kill 3 men and once married, do not go to war unless there is an emergency. Plato's Athenian Stranger (*Laws* 804e–805a) also knows of the Sauromatae women of his time, along the Pontus, who ride on horseback and learn to use bows and other weapons just as the men do. Thus Ctesias' Zarinaea belongs to a tradition of fictional and—it seems—actual Scythian warrior women.

---

[32] Sulimirski 1985, 189–190 and 154. Rolle 1989, 86–91 has a description of the graves of Scythian and Sauromatae warrior women; cf. Lefkowitz 1986, 18–19, 22–23.

[33] For an analysis of Herodotus' tale of the Amazons as a reversal, inversion, or mirror image of Greek customs, see Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 998–1003; Hartog 1988, 216–224; Dewald 1981, 99–101; Tyrrell 1984, 41–43; cf. Flory 1987, 108–113.

[34] Here the Sauromatae are termed an ἔθνος Σκυθικόν; cf. Strabo 11. 6. 2.

Effete men

Ancient Greek accounts of vigorous women are often linked with parallel tales of effete men; we have already encountered one such pair, Semiramis and Ninyas.[35] If Scythian or Sauromatae women are unusually powerful and take upon themselves some of the traditional roles of men, Scythian men, according to ancient sources, can be correspondingly weak and effeminate. (We do not know if this was true of the Scythian king Cydraeus, Zarinaea's brother-husband and predecessor on the throne.) Herodotus (1. 105) tells us that a small group of Scythian men looted a temple of Aphrodite in Ascalon and the goddess punished them by sending to them and their descendants a "female disease". The men suffering from the disease are called "Enarees" (ἐνάρεας).[36] We hear more of these effeminate Scythians in the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, Places*. Rich Scythians, we are told, become impotent and perform women's tasks on an equal footing with them; such men are called "Anarieis" (Ἀναριεῖς). The Scythians attribute this to a divine visitation, says the author of the Hippocratic tract, but actually their impotence is due to excessive horseback riding. The men affected think they have sinned and they dress as women, act as women, and join with women in their toil (*AWP* 22). Such emasculated men are the reverse side of the coin, the complement to the virile, Amazon-like women described earlier.

In his Median history, Books 4 and 5 of the *Persica*,[37] Ctesias himself balances our story of a beautiful and warlike woman with another tale which features effeminate men, the story of Nanarus and Parsondes. Both Diodorus and Nicolaus of Damascus summarize this section of the *Persica*. When dealing with Zarinaea, the Medes, and the Sacae, the two historians Diodorus and Nicolaus present Ctesias' history very differently, each in his own manner. Diodorus, as we have seen, is sober and conventional, while Nicolaus has plenty of spicy, colorful detail;[38] we find these same qualities in their narratives on Nanarus, Parsondes, and the Median-Cadusian conflict. Diodorus relates that Parsondes, the most powerful aide of the Median king Artaeus, becomes vexed with the king over some decision

[35] Above, p. 82; see too Brosius 1996, 96, 195–199.

[36] Cf. Hdt. 4. 67. 2 where we are told that these men, termed ἀνδρόγυνοι, have been granted the gift of prophecy by Aphrodite.

[37] See Jacoby 1922, 2042.

[38] Cf. Biltcliffe 1969, 92 n. 31 and see below.

(ἔν τινι κρίσει) and flees to the Cadusians. Parsondes persuades the Cadusians to rebel against the Medes, leads their successful struggle for independence and is subsequently chosen king. Thus Diodorus' summary of this section of the *Persica* (2. 33. 1–6) is a fairly straightforward, "historical" account. Nicolaus, on the other hand, in his adaptation of Ctesias (*FGrH* 90 F4), concentrates on the reasons behind Parsondes' defection, the κρίσις briefly noted by Diodorus. He tells a complicated, picturesque tale of the enmity between Parsondes and an effete Babylonian satrap named Nanarus. Nanarus captures his opponent Parsondes and transforms him into a music girl. Parsondes eventually returns home but Artaeus, despite an earlier promise, does not execute Nanarus for his misdeeds. Nicolaus' account with its assortment of eunuchs, music girls, plots and counter-plots, promises, and attempts at revenge is "history" of an altogether different kind, and may well be closer in spirit and content to the original *Persica*. But both Diodorus' summary and Nicolaus' adaptation of the Cnidian's history indicate that Ctesias concentrated on only two events in his history of Media: the hostility between the Medes and the Cadusians, a conflict featuring effete men, and the Medes' war with the Sacae, the tale of a strong-minded woman.

Zarinaea on the battlefield

Let us return to the Mede-Sacian battlefield. Demetrius tell us that the Mede general Stryangaeus unseats Zarinaea from her horse.[39] Presumably the queen is wounded by the fall and Stryangaeus does her no further damage. Did the Mede commander realize that his opponent was a woman when he first attacked her? We have seen that Semiramis, before going off to her first battle, designs a special cloak which makes it impossible to tell whether the wearer is male or female (*FGrH* 688 F1b 6. 6). Atossa, another warrior queen of *DM*, introduces trousers, so that men and women will dress uniformly and Zarinaea, too, may have been wearing clothing or armor which disguised the fact that she was female. Very quickly, however, her sexual identity becomes apparent. After Stryangaeus unhorses and pursues the queen, she has to rely upon pleas (cf. ἱκετεύουσα in our notice) and not her military abilities in order to survive. In

[39] See too Tzetzes *Chiliades* 12. 898–899; Finckh 1860 argues convincingly that Tzetzes takes his information from Demetrius and not the *Persica* itself.

Demetrius' account, Zarinaea's beauty is what induces Stryangaeus to save her and Diodorus mentions the queen's outstanding appearance as well.[40] Like Xenophon's Panthea, Zarinaea may have inadvertently revealed her attractions in the course of an emotional outburst or perhaps she was both seductive and eloquent.[41] Stryangaeus is struck by Zarinaea's beauty at this, their very first encounter on the battlefield, but our sources report that he falls in love with her only later, after Mermerus has been killed (Nicolaus) and a truce has been concluded between the Scythians and the Medes (Demetrius). The Mede general releases Zarinaea: if Ctesias' queen of the Sacae enters the battlefield a stalwart, Amazon-like warrior, she leaves it a woman who uses feminine tactics, even wiles, in order to be spared by her male opponent.

Penthesilea, Hippolyte, and Scythian warrior queens

Schwartz traces this motif of the beautiful woman warrior who awakens love in a male opponent back to the tale of Achilles and the Amazon queen Penthesilea.[42] Achilles kills Penthesilea on the battlefield and it is only after the Amazon is mortally wounded that he is struck by her beauty and falls in love with her.[43] The parallel with Penthesilea is illuminating, because Achilles treats the Amazon queen as an equal while doing battle—compare the Ἀμαζόνες ἀντιάνειραι whom Priam fights in Homer (*Il.* 3. 189; cf. 6. 186)—and acknowledges her as a woman only after he defeats her.[44] Stryangaeus, in a sense, condescends to Zarinaea when he spares her: as soon as the Mede general sees that his opponent is a woman, he no longer seems to find her an adversary worth fighting. Ctesias frequently includes duel scenes between opposing leaders in the *Persica*,[45] but there is only one other instance in which a warrior treats his wounded opponent mercifully: Megabyzus spares Ousiris so that he will act as an intermediary with Artaxerxes (*FGrH* 688 F14. 40). Elsewhere in the

[40] *FGrH* 688 F8a; F5. 34. 3.
[41] Cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 5. 1. 6–7.
[42] Schwartz 1943, 75.
[43] See the summary of Arctinus' *Aethiopis* in Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 175–180 (= pp. 105–106 Homer OCT V, ed. Allen). Cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus 1. 654–674, 718–721 and see Keuls 1993, 45–49 on the cup by the Penthesilea Painter.
[44] See Blok 1994, esp. 195–288 for the Ἀμαζόνες ἀντιάνειραι and a detailed treatment of the Penthesilea tale.
[45] Bigwood 1976, 19.

Persica we do not find any particular consideration displayed towards women warriors by their male opponents. The Indian king first abuses the aggressive Semiramis by letter and then twice wounds her when he meets up with her on the battlefield,[46] while Sparethra, another Scythian queen found in the *Persica*, is quite successful in battle.[47] She is not bested in an encounter with the enemy and does not have to rely upon the mercies of her foe, Cyrus the Great, on the battlefield. Instead, Sparethra captures important hostages and arranges for the release of her husband, the Sacian king Amorges (*FGrH* 688 F9. 3). Herodotus' Tomyris is another Scythian-type queen who asks for no pity and eventually defeats her enemy.

In their respective tales, all three Scythian queens—Tomyris, Sparethra, and Zarinaea—combine political and personal concerns. Tomyris sets out both to avenge the death of her son and preserve her kingdom, while Sparethra takes to the battlefield to rescue her husband and save her country. Zarinaea is the only one of the three who transfers her allegiance in the course of her tale. In this, her divided loyalties, she resembles the Amazon queen Hippolyte. Conflicting stories are told of Hippolyte, also known as Antiope, who was brought to Athens by Theseus. Most interesting for our purposes is the version according to which Hippolyte is not abducted by Theseus but willingly follows him because she is in love with the king.[48] Her fellow Amazons come to Athens to rescue her, but she fights at Theseus' side against them and dies.[49] Once married, Hippolyte can no longer be an Amazon: the Amazons are vehemently opposed to social marriage and Theseus has, it seems, aggregated her into the role of a Greek woman. Hippolyte has been transformed into a "proper" woman, a wife.[50] One can, apparently, be a woman warrior or a loyal wife—but not both. A rare exception to this rule is Ctesias' Sparethra, who is both successful in war and happily married to Amorges. Zarinaea who arranges for Mermerus to die and then rejects Stryangaeus, is, like nearly all the women of *DM*, singularly unlucky in her private life.

Tomyris and Sparethra point to an interesting difference between the tales told of the Amazons and those relating to the Scythian

---

[46] *FGrH* 688 F1b 18. 1; 19. 7.
[47] Jacoby 1922, 2059 calls her "eine Doppelgängerin der Zarinaia."
[48] Isoc. *Panath.* 193; Pausanias 1. 2. 1.
[49] Diod. 4. 28. 3–4; Plut. *Theseus* 28. 4.
[50] See du Bois 1982, 40–41 and Tyrrell 1984, 92; cf. Macdonald 1987a, 6–7.

warrior queens of Ctesias and Herodotus. The Amazons always lose in their battles with Greek heroes, but Scythian women can and do vanquish their enemies in these Greek sources—perhaps because they fight Persians rather than Greeks. In Herodotus, Scythians are sometimes cast in the role of Athenians (or Greeks) in their encounters with the Persians and this may be one reason why the Scythian queens gain the upper hand.[51] Perhaps Tomyris and Sparethra are allowed to be victorious because they are fighting for their families: these mothers and wives are less anomalous and frightening than Amazons.[52] In addition, having a woman defeat the Persian king is a means sometimes used by Greek writers to cast ridicule upon the powerful ruler and emphasize his decadence.

Zarinaea, described by Diodorus as a daring and accomplished warrior (F5. 34. 3–4), does not defeat the enemy here. In this battle—the sole military engagement of hers which is described in any detail in our sources—the queen is brave, but not successful. The military conflict between the Scythians and the Medes was eventually resolved by peaceful means,[53] and we hear of no brilliant return match in which Zarinaea outdoes Stryangaeus in battle.

Prisoners, pleas and duels in Ctesias

This part of Zarinaea's tale—the blow she receives while on horseback, Stryangaeus' pursuit of her across the battlefield, her subsequent pleas for her life, and the Mede's decision to spare the beautiful queen—is, of course, remarkably colorful and must have been elaborated at great length in the original *Persica.* Ctesias was well known as a sensational and long-winded writer[54] and we can assume that he made full (or possibly excessive) use of his dramatic materials here. It would have been particularly interesting to read Ctesias' original version of the scene in which Zarinaea beseeches Stryangaeus. A somewhat similar episode in the *Persica* in which Parysatis begs her son Artaxerxes to spare his brother, Cyrus the Younger, seems to have been remarkably emotional. The queen mother wraps her arms and tresses of hair around Cyrus and clings

---

[51] See Hartog 1988, esp. 35–40.
[52] See below, p. 200.
[53] *FGrH* 688 F5. 34. 2 (Diodorus); see F8a σπονδῶν γενομένων (Demetrius).
[54] Cf. *FGrH* 688 T11, T13, T14.

to his neck while beseeching Artaxerxes to release him (F17), but Ctesias' Parysatis is perhaps a particularly vehement and strong-minded figure.[55]

In the next stage of the Zarinaea-Stryangaeus affair, the Mede commander is captured by the queen's husband, Mermerus. Did the two engage in close combat on the battlefield? We have already seen that Ctesias is fond of duels between commanders of opposing factions; one of the leading figures of the *Persica*, Megabyzus, engages in no fewer than three such duels.[56] Stryangaeus after encountering Zarinaea on the battlefield, could have had a second contest with the queen's husband, and Mermerus himself may have taken the Mede general prisoner. Why does Mermerus decide to kill Stryangaeus? He may have been jealous of the relationship between Zarinaea and Stryangaeus. The Mede, Nicolaus tells us, is son-in-law of the king, and as such must have been a valuable hostage, who was worth more alive than dead. The taking of hostages or prisoners, while often found in the battles of the *Persica* (and in real-life conflicts as well), seems to be a particularly important motif in tales of Scythian queens. Tomyris' son is captured by the Herodotean Cyrus, while Ctesias' Cyrus manages to seize Sparethra's husband; here it is Zarinaea's benefactor who is captured. In all three of these colorful stories, it is the one who originally takes prisoners who is outwitted or punished.[57]

Zarinaea appeals to her husband to spare the Mede, to no avail. The queen's failure to win over her husband is in decided contrast to her encounter with Stryangaeus, where her powers of persuasion save her life. The word δεομένη in our notice—there is an alternate reading, θελομένη—seems to indicate that Zarinaea pleaded emotionally with Mermerus. It is likely that Ctesias, who apparently included a great many speeches and dialogues in the *Persica*,[58] reported both Zarinaea's exchange with the Mede commander on the battlefield and her later conversation with her husband and it would have been interesting to compare the two scenes. Nicolaus, in his reworking of the *Persica* (*FGrH* 90 F5), records a later conversation between Zarinaea and Stryangaeus and there the queen seems both sensible and soft-spoken.

[55] See Brosius 1996, 3–4, 110–116, 119–122 for a judicious assessment of Parysatis.
[56] *FGrH* 688 F14. 37, 40, 41.
[57] See on Tomyris, p. 200.
[58] Gera 1993, 206–209.

The murder of Mermerus and Stryangaeus' suicide: ADM's version

When Mermerus refuses her request, the Sacian queen changes her allegiance. She releases some prisoners and together with them assassinates her husband: Stryangaeus may have been one of the released prisoners who assisted her. The language of our notice, "and with them killed Mermerus" (σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸν Μέρμερον ἀνεῖλε) makes it plain that the queen participated in the actual killing of her husband. We do not know what motivated her change of loyalties. Zarinaea may have acted out of gratitude or even love towards the Mede general, but her action could be related to the peace settlement she will later negotiate with the Medes. Perhaps Mermerus objected to ending the war. Zarinaea is the only woman in *DM* said to kill her husband and it is probably significant that Mermerus was Zarinaea's second husband, an outsider and a Parthian, and not the man thanks to whom she became queen.

Stryangaeus' suicide note

The fact that Zarinaea participates in the assassination of Mermerus and thus saves Stryangaeus' life is a crucial element in the queen's tale; this feature of her story appears only in *DM* and raises several difficulties. We know from three other sources—Demetrius, Nicolaus and *P. Oxy.* 2330—that Stryangaeus will subsequently fall in love with Zarinaea, be rejected by her, and commit suicide. Nicolaus has him use a sword, while according to Demetrius, Stryangaeus starves himself to death, a method which is thought to demonstrate noble resoluteness.[59] ADM makes no mention of Stryangaeus' subsequent fate and there is nothing in our notice of the Mede's unrequited love for Zarinaea, his farewell letter, or suicide. Before killing himself, Stryangaeus writes an accusatory letter to Zarinaea and the opening words of this letter plainly state that he has saved her life only to be destroyed by her in return: ἐγὼ μὲν σὲ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ δι' ἐμὲ ἐσώθης, ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ σὲ ἀπωλόμην.... These famous first words of Stryangaeus' suicide letter are quoted by Demetrius, paraphrased by Nicolaus, and actually appear in the only extant papyrus assigned to the *Persica*, a papyrus which is generally agreed to contain Ctesias' *ipsissima verba.*[60]

[59] van Hooff 1990, 45–47, 101.
[60] See e.g. Roberts 1954; Bigwood 1986.

Even if we make allowances for the fact that Stryangaeus is about to kill himself and consequently writes in melodramatic fashion, it is hard to see how the Mede could stress so strongly that he has saved Zarinaea and yet ignore the fact that the Sacian queen has been his savior as well, if she in fact killed her husband for his sake, as ADM states here. Ctesias could have attributed to Stryangaeus an opening which would be no less full of pathos and yet in accordance with the version of events found in *DM*—a statement akin to "I saved you once and you saved me in return, but now you destroy me"—but this is not what we find. (Interestingly, suicide notes such as this were quite rare in the ancient world.)[61] Stryangaeus' words aside, his rejection by Zarinaea is difficult to understand if the queen has earlier assassinated her husband in order to save his life. In Nicolaus' account, Stryangaeus and Zarinaea fall in love *after* the death of Mermerus: the extant portion of Nicolaus' version begins immediately after the king's assassination μετὰ τὴν ἀναίρεσιν Μαρμάρεω, so that while Nicolaus seems to know that Mermerus was murdered, he provides no evidence as to who does the actual killing. Nicolaus tells us that although Zarinaea loves the Mede, she nonetheless rejects his advances, pointing out that he is married to the fair Roetaea, daughter of the Mede king Astibaras, and must remain loyal to his wife. She urges Stryangaeus to be as manly in love as he is in war; an alliance between them, says Zarinaea, would be shameful for them both. The queen's attitude in Nicolaus is totally inconsistent with her having earlier arranged the murder of her husband for the Mede's sake. Why kill your husband, only to reject your suitor? Is an illicit affair with a married man more "shameful" than the assassination of one's spouse?

It may well be that *DM* presents an accurate summary of the *Persica* tale and simply reproduces inconsistencies found in Ctesias' original version. Or Ctesias may have somehow resolved, explained, or justified the Sacian queen's mystifying behavior. Perhaps Zarinaea's experience with her domineering second husband is what leads her to reject the Mede's advances: even Diodorus' rather bland summary suggests that the Ctesian heroine was a complex figure. Another possibility is that ADM presents an inaccurate or garbled version of events (as he does, for example, when writing of Artemisia—see below, p. 211). ADM tells us that Zarinaea killed Mermerus with

[61] van Hooff 1990, 101–102, 120, and 270 n. 88.

the aid of some captured Medes; perhaps in the original *Persica* version, these Mede prisoners did the dirty work by themselves on their own initiative. In any event, if we did not have the testimony of *DM* here and simply relied upon all the other witnesses to Ctesias' *Persica*, we would have a different image of Zarinaea. The queen would seem more virtuous and upright, and her moralizing rejection of the married Stryangaeus more comprehensible.

Zarinaea the peacemaker

The conflict between the Medes and the Sacae ends peaceably. "She surrendered the territory to the Persian" (παραδοῦσα τῷ Πέρσῃ τὴν χώραν) in our notice must mean that Zarinaea hands over the Parthians' territory, not the land of the Sacae, to the Medes, for Diodorus describes the peace as one where the Parthians are ruled by the Medes (Πάρθους μὲν ὑπὸ Μήδους τετάχθαι 2. 34. 2). He adds that the two main powers, the Medes and the Sacae agree to be friends and allies.[62]

Our notice ends with the resolution of the Median-Sacian conflict, but Diodorus' summary of the *Persica* (2. 34. 1–5) makes it plain that Ctesias described—if only briefly—the rest of Zarinaea's career, her death and burial. The queen, we are told, civilizes her land, and tends to the welfare of her countrymen. She has the largest tomb in the land and is granted the honors accorded heroes, honors more magnificent than any awarded her ancestors.

ADM as epitomator

The original *Persica*, then, contained enough information to allow ADM to fashion a notice relating to Zarinaea's entire career, a notice more similar in style to his previous report of Semiramis, but this is not what is found in our text. It is curious how different the first two sections of *DM* are. Both notices are based on accounts in the same author, Ctesias, who undoubtedly described both women in considerable, colorful detail, even if his story of Semiramis was much longer. If elsewhere the content and scope of our notices seem

---

[62] For the historical basis for the "semi-allied, semi-dependent relations" between Media and the Sacae described here, see Diakonoff 1985, 127; Vogelsang 1992, 173–177, 186, and 212–218. Contrast Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1988b.

to reflect the information available in the original sources (above, p. 31), here two closely similar original accounts have led to quite different kinds of notices. The two woman warriors, Semiramis and Zarinaea, have a great deal in common as rulers and both are also embroiled in similar romantic triangles, involving betrayed husbands, importuning lovers, and a suicide. Yet ADM's summary of their tales is quite different. For Semiramis he uses a rather dry, encyclopedic approach, surveying the whole of the queen's life and deeds and glossing over her relationships with men, while with Zarinaea he chooses to concentrate on a single battle and the queen's tangled romantic affairs. (He nonetheless omits the melodramatic end to the Zarinaea-Stryangaeus affair, the Mede's suicide.) This inconsistent method of summary—facts and figures in the first notice, dramatic highlights in the second—makes it difficult to characterize the interests and aims of our anonymous author when compiling his collection. In any event, it is worth remembering that despite the relatively large number of sources we have for Zarinaea's story, *DM* supplies us with two items of unique information: (1) the name of the Sacian queen's first husband (and the very fact of this marriage) and (2) her complicity in the death of her second husband.

Zarinaea herself seems to embrace a wide variety of roles. As ruler, she conducts a vigorous foreign policy, waging war and arranging alliances, and she is greatly loved by her subjects. She is also beautiful and seductive, and survives on the battlefield by virtue of her womanly charms, not her fighting abilities. Her political actions are linked to her changing relationships with men and it is unfortunate that we cannot establish which was the cause and which the effect.

NITOCRIS THE EGYPTIAN

Source: Herodotus 2. 100.
Related Sources: Manetho *FGrH* 609 F2, F3a–b; Eratosthenes (?) *FGrH* 610 F1 κβ; Dio Cassius 62. 6.

The historical Nitocris

Did Nitocris actually exist? While there are serious chronological difficulties in this section of Herodotus' Egyptian history (2. 99–142),[1] the historian apparently preserves authentic Egyptian tradition here. There was, it seems, an Egyptian queen named Nitocris who ruled at the end of the Old Kingdom Sixth Dynasty, ca. 2300 BC. Her existence is attested in Egyptian records—the Turin papyrus—as well as in the surviving fragments of Manetho, the 3rd century BC Egyptian priest who wrote a history of Egypt in Greek.[2] There is, however, no archaeological evidence for the queen, no inscribed monuments or known tomb, so that some experts question her reality.[3] Nitocris was the first known queen to rule in Egypt,[4] "a woman instead of a man" as one Greek source puts it (ἐβασίλευε Νίτωκρις γυνὴ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός).[5] She rules after her brother, the king, is killed. This king was apparently Merenre II, son of Pepy II and Neith, and he reigned, it seems, for a year.[6] Herodotus is our only source on his assassination and we do not know why the Egyptians killed him or how Nitocris became ruler in his stead. Commentators point out that the queen reigned in a time of confusion and distress; they note that at the end of the twelfth dynasty, another turbulent time, a woman was once again in charge of Egypt.[7] A recent study discusses the "feminization" of the masculine elements of Egyptian kingship: these androgynous features are said to have facilitated the acceptance of female monarchs.[8]

---

[1] See Drews 1973, 56; Lloyd 1975, 185–194.
[2] *FGrH* 609 F2, F3b; cf. Waddell 1940, 54–57, frr. 20–21.
[3] See e.g. Tyldesley 1994, 216.
[4] Tyldesley 1994, 214–215 suggests that the shadowy Meryt-Neith of the 1st Dynasty was an earlier independent ruler.
[5] Cf. Grimal 1992, 89. The source may be Eratosthenes: *FGrH* 610 F1 κβ.
[6] Grimal 1992, 89; cf. Newberry 1943, 53, who thinks that Nitocris was the *sister* of Pepy II, who was supposedly an infant when Merenre died, thus allowing her to become virtual ruler of Egypt.
[7] Waddell 1940, 54 n. 2; Gardiner 1961, 102; cf. Lloyd 1988, 14 and Tyldesley 1994, 214.
[8] Troy 1986, esp. 139–150.

Nitocris, Rhodopis and the pyramids

Traditions concerning Nitocris certainly survived a long time and that may be why different sources paint such varied pictures of the queen. The Nitocris of other writers barely resembles Herodotus' vengeful ruler and it is almost as if a different person is being described. In Herodotus—and, of course, in *DM* which is based on the *History*—Nitocris is renowned for one crucial incident, her singular act of vengeance against her brother's murderers, and all the rest of her tale leads up to this act. Thus the huge chamber she erects is not simply a noteworthy building constructed by a woman, akin to the Babylonian Nitocris' various works or Semiramis' fortifications, but the means she uses to trap her enemies.

In other sources we hear nothing of Nitocris' brother or her act of vengeance and only her building is mentioned. In Manetho, Nitocris is noted for her beauty and nobility, her fair coloring and rosy cheeks, and for the pyramid she supposedly builds. The only hint of the Herodotean Nitocris is to be found in a description of her as bravest among men,[9] but she is termed immediately afterwards most beautiful among women and the first phrase may be no more than a reflection of the fact that she ruled in her own right. Manetho's pink and blonde Egyptian queen is, due, in part, to the confusion of Nitocris with the courtesan Rhodopis.[10] Rhodopis, the notorious beauty who counted Sappho's brother among her lovers, lived in Egypt and was said to have built a pyramid there. Subsequently she was confused or conflated with Nitocris: one woman who allegedly built a pyramid was identified with another. Rhodopis is supposed to have constructed the pyramid with the proceeds of her considerable earnings. Herodotus (2. 134–135) pointedly denies the tale, but in other writers the courtesan builds a pyramid or is entombed in one.[11] Strabo (17. 1. 33) even gives Rhodopis a Cinderella-like sandal which an eagle brings to the king. There is very little relation between this courtesan and Herodotus' bloodthirsty queen, but Manetho's intermediary account may reflect authentic, positive traditions relating to the Egyptian queen.

---

[9] This is in the Armenian version of Eusebius' summary of Manetho *FGrH* 609 F3a; see Waddell 1940, 56–57.

[10] Cf. Coche-Zivie 1972, esp. 131; Lloyd 1988, 14–15; Tyldesley 1994, 217–218.

[11] Diod. 1. 64. 14; Pliny *Nat.* 36. 82.

Herodotus' Nitocris

Herodotus' account of the Egyptian queen is quite brief and our notice is clearly closely based on the original. There are several near verbal echoes: καλέσασαν ... τοὺς μάλιστα μεταιτίους Hdt. ~ τοὺς μάλιστα αἰτίους συγκαλέσασα *DM*; οἴκημα περίμηκες Hdt. ~ ἐπιμήκει οἴκῳ *DM*; ῥίψαι ἐς οἴκημα σποδοῦ πλέον Hdt., ~ εἰς οἴκημά τι σποδοῦ πλῆρες ἐνέβαλεν *DM*. Nitocris, we are told, ascends to the throne after her brother the king, is assassinated by the Egyptians. It is very likely that Nitocris' brother is also her husband, as brother-sister marriage was customary in Egyptian royal families.[12] If Nitocris set about avenging the death of her brother-husband at once, her reign must have been short-lived, although we should allow time for the construction of the huge underground chamber to which she invites her enemies. One scholar points out that this building resembles the pyramid constructed by Cheops in Herodotus (2. 124.4; cf. 2. 127. 2): both are said to be subterranean chambers, with water brought in through a channel.[13] Thus even in the *History*, Nitocris builds something like a pyramid.

In her construction feats and use of waterworks, the Egyptian queen reminds us of her namesake in Herodotus, Nitocris the Babylonian. Both the Nitocrises are vengeful and deceitful figures, and when later sources simply refer to "Nitocris", with no further description, it is not always easy to tell which one is meant.[14] The name Nitocris is, however, not Babylonian, but Egyptian and theophoric; it means "Neith is excellent". One Greek writer translates it Ἀθηνᾶ Νικηφόρος.[15]

The Egyptian Nitocris, like so many of the women in *DM*, uses deception in order to achieve her aims. Herodotus explicitly uses the word δόλῳ, explaining that Nitocris invites the guilty Egyptians to a feast on the pretense that she wishes to celebrate the opening of her new chamber, but with the actual intent of killing them. ADM simply uses the word ἑστιῶσα, thus making it clear that the Egyptians were killed while feasting. The "fatal feast" is a common folktale

[12] Cerny 1954; Hopkins 1980, 306–307, 311; Coche-Zivie 1972, 126 with n. 1. It is worth noting nonetheless that Egyptian kinship terminology was fluid and "sister" could be used of a wide variety of women including wife, mistress, cousin, aunt etc. See Troy 1986, 104; Tyldesley 1994, 48–49.

[13] Coche-Zivie 1972, 127.

[14] See e.g. Dio Cassius 79. 23; Julian *Or.* 3. 127b and cf. Flory 1987, 42–43.

[15] *FGrH* 610 F1 κβ; cf. Waddell 1940, 54 n. 2 and Lloyd 1988, 13.

motif and the closest Herodotean parallel to our story is the banquet, ending in fire, arranged for Sesostris by his brother (Hdt. 2. 107).[16]

Nitocris does not choose to die along with her enemies, but flings herself into a room filled with ashes.[17] There is, perhaps, some contrast intended here between the method of the Egyptians' death—a chamber filled with water—and the death Nitocris chooses for herself, which involves the opposite elements of fire and ashes. Dido, the only other woman in *DM* who commits suicide, also uses fire, flinging herself into a pyre. Both Dido and Nitocris kill themselves, ultimately, because of their attachment to a dead spouse, but Dido acts only against herself, while Nitocris first avenges herself on those who are responsible for her brother's death. If Dido cannot face living with another man, the Egyptian queen, according to Herodotus, commits suicide in order to avoid punishment. Lateiner thinks that Herodotus is prejudiced against women who assert themselves in public and that the historian censures the queen for her savage behavior here, but Herodotus' comment on her end is quite neutral in tone, in decided contrast to e.g. his explicit remarks on Pheretime's death (4. 205).[18]

Nitocris and DM

This notice, with its verbal echoes of Herodotus, is strong evidence for ADM having consulted his original sources directly. Although the account in *DM* (and in Herodotus) is quite brief and concentrates on a single incident—Nitocris' revenge—our notice includes almost all the main themes of *DM*. Nitocris is a woman who comes to power after her husband dies; she performs masculine feats, building a hall and channeling water, but nonetheless uses duplicity as well; she avenges the death of a close relative; and she succeeds in her quest. Since Nitocris' tale encompasses so many of the motifs of *DM*, the Egyptian queen resembles many other women in the

---

[16] Compare Amyntas' feast for the Persians (5. 18–20). Elsewhere, such feasts are used by "civilized" peoples to entrap innocents unused to the refinements of civilization, as in the meal Cyrus prepares for the Massagetan troops (Hdt. 1. 211; cf. on Tomyris, p. 196). See Lloyd 1975, 107 with n. 85; 1988, 15; Flory 1987, 42–43.

[17] Elsewhere we find death by ashes used by Persians as a method of punishment—see Garrison 1991, 14 with n. 44.

[18] Lateiner 1989, 138; see below on Pheretime, p. 170.

work. Nitocris, like Semiramis and Nitocris the Babylonian, engages in vast building works; like Pheretime and Tomyris, she punishes those responsible for the death of a family member; like Dido, she commits suicide. But unlike many of the women in *DM*, the Egyptian queen is not chiefly interested in power: vengeance is her overriding concern.

Nitocris the Babylonian

Source: Herodotus 1. 185–187.
Related Sources: Plutarch *Moralia* 173b; cf. Stobaeus 10. 53.

Who was Nitocris?

Herodotus is the *only* ancient writer to tell of Nitocris and his account of the queen can be divided into two halves: her public works and her deceitful tomb inscription. ADM summarizes his source well here, preserving the balance found in Herodotus between the two parts of Nitocris' tale and repeating the essentials of the historian's account. He takes pains to record (in slightly altered fashion) Nitocris' chief achievements: the reservoir, the quay, and the bridge. We shall see that the language of our notice closely echoes the historian's text, so that it is very likely that ADM consulted Herodotus firsthand.

It is virtually impossible to identify the Halicarnassian's Babylonian queen with any one historical person. While some commentators suggest that Nitocris is an imaginary figure,[1] others put forward a whole series of candidates for the real-life personage whom the queen is meant to be. The difficulties begin with Nitocris' name "which we cannot understand from an Assyriological point of view."[2] It is generally agreed that the Babylonian Nitocris' name derives from that of the homonymous Egyptian queen described by Herodotus in Book 2.[3] Herodotus himself points out there that the queens have identical names (2. 100. 2) and Nitocris is a common Egyptian name borne by several princesses.[4] The Babylonian Nitocris is in certain ways similar to the Egyptian queen, who is, of course, also found in *DM*: both are deceitful women rulers who change the course of a river.[5] This similarity between the two women, taken together with their identical names, is one obstacle in the attempt to identify the Babylonian Nitocris as a historical figure.[6]

---

[1] See e.g. Legrand 1970, 119; MacGinnis 1986, 78–79.
[2] Ravn 1942, 90.
[3] Röllig 1969, 134; Ravn 1942, 38; Lewy 1952, 285 with n. 96 etc.
[4] Lloyd 1988, 15 (ad Hdt. 2. 100); he suggests that our Nitocris' name may have derived from a Saite princess who had married into the Babylonian royal family.
[5] See above, p. 103.
[6] Momigliano 1969, 185–186.

Nitocris and Semiramis

Another queen whom our Nitocris resembles even more closely is Semiramis, and she is actually compared to the Assyrian ruler in our notice. "Babylonian" and "Assyrian" are used interchangeably in Herodotus (and many other early Greek writers)[7] and the historian describes Semiramis, the only other "Babylonian" queen in the *History* immediately before telling of Nitocris (1. 184). The two queens are the only Babylonian rulers whom Herodotus mentions, even though he promises to tell of other Babylonian kings in his (non-extant) Assyrian logoi; this promise has raised considerable scholarly speculation.[8] Herodotus states that Semiramis built remarkable embankments in order to prevent the Euphrates from flooding the plain. He then adds (1. 185. 1) that Nitocris was more intelligent than Semiramis, both because of her μνημόσυνα (i.e. public works) and because she was aware of Median expansionism and consequently took the precaution of changing the course of the Euphrates in order to slow down the approach to Babylon. The two Babylonian queens nonetheless sound remarkably alike and scholars suspect that they are, in fact, one and the same figure.[9] Plutarch, for example, confuses the two and has Darius plunder Semiramis' tomb (below, p. 118). Herodotus *may* have been the earliest Greek writer to mention Semiramis[10] and his Semiramis, interestingly enough, seems to be a peacetime figure interested in improving agriculture, while it is Nitocris who is worried about war, engages in a great many building projects, and leaves behind a provocative inscription. The Herodotean Nitocris is certainly more notable than his briefly described Semiramis, but Ctesias' Semiramis outshines both of the Halicarnassian's Babylonian queens. Thus ADM demonstrates good sense when he uses Ctesias' colorful militant queen, rather than Herodotus' minor figure, as the source for his notice on Semiramis. Nonetheless our anonymous author complicates matters here when he includes Herodotus' judgment in favor of Nitocris: readers of *DM* are likely to think that Nitocris is more clever than the Semiramis described earlier by ADM, i.e. more clever than *Ctesias'* Semiramis.

---

[7] Drews 1970, 184 n. 8; Macqueen 1978, 284 n. 1; MacGinnis 1986, 68 etc.

[8] See e.g. Drews 1970 and Macqueen 1978.

[9] Momigliano 1969, 183–186; Kuhrt 1987, 543; Atossa (below, p. 141) is a third variation on these queens.

[10] Cf. Kuhrt 1987, 543–544, 551 n. 39.

Nitocris and Naqi'a

Herodotus, then, compares Semiramis and Nitocris, while Ctesias seems to blend the two figures into one, assigning to Semiramis most of the deeds attributed to Nitocris in the *History* (below, p. 112). One scholar, Lewy, makes use of Ctesias' legendary Semiramis to argue that Nitocris was in fact a powerful Assyrian queen, Naqi'a, wife of Sennacherib (ruled 704–681 BC) and the mother of Esarhaddon (680–669 BC). According to this theory, many of the feats ascribed by Ctesias to Semiramis-Nitocris and her husband Ninus in the *Persica*, such as the building of a capital city or irrigation works, are in fact deeds of the historical Naqi'a and her husband Sennacherib. Lewy also contends that the queen-consort Naqi'a was a ruler in her own right in Babylonia, from approximately 683 to 670 BC.[11] Other scholars recognize the influential role played by Naqi'a—who built a palace at Nineveh, dedicated cult objects, received military reports, and twice helped determine who would inherit the royal throne[12]—but point out that there is no real proof that Naqi'a either ruled independently or was involved in the building of Babylon.[13] In other words this powerful queen mother (and queen grandmother) does not actually resemble Herodotus' Nitocris.[14] A further difficulty is that Naqi'a clearly was not the mother of Nabonidus—while Herodotus' Nitocris is specifically said to be the mother of Labynetus—and there is no evidence for any family relationship between Naqi'a and Nabonidus.[15]

Nitocris and Adad-Guppi

This brings us to the question of Nitocris' family. ADM, somewhat uncharacteristically, does not mention any of Nitocris' male relations: only two other women in *DM*, Rhodogyne and Onomaris, are presented entirely on their own with no male relatives. Here, ADM's source, Herodotus, does tell of Nitocris' male connections. She is, he says, wife of one Labynetus and mother of another: Cyrus defeats

[11] Lewy 1952.
[12] Nitocris played a crucial role in promoting her son Esarhaddon to the throne and it was due to her influence that her grandson Ashurbanipal was subsequently chosen to be king—see Ben-Barak 1987, 34 and 37.
[13] See e.g. Grayson 1991, 138–139; Frame 1992, 92–93; Reade 1987, esp. 142–145.
[14] Cf. Baumgartner 1959, 324–325, 328–329.
[15] *Pace* Lewy 1952, 278; cf. Gadd 1958, 54.

the younger Labynetus when he conquers Babylon. The name Labynetus is equivalent linguistically to Nabonidus[16] and this younger Labynetus is clearly Nabonidus, the last of the neo-Babylonian rulers.[17] Consequently it has been suggested that Nitocris is actually Adad-Guppi, the mother of Nabonidus.[18] This identification works well chronologically, for Nitocris is dated by Herodotus to five generations after Semiramis (Hdt. 1. 184) and the long-lived Adad-guppi was born in 649/48, some 150 years or five generations after the Assyrian queen generally thought to be the figure behind Semiramis, Sammuramat, wife of Shamshi-Adad V (823–810 BC) and mother of Adad-nirari III (809–782 BC).[19] Adad-Guppi did not belong to the Babylonian royal family but was quite influential at court, and she helped bring about the ascent of her son Nabonidus to the throne. This queen mother is unique among Assyrian-Babylonian women in having her own formal inscription.[20] Such an honor was never granted to any Assyrian or Babylonian queen.[21] Her inscription, while not a funerary one, mentions the queen mother's burial and the mourning which followed, and calls upon the reader to worship the gods of Babylon (iii. 5 ff.), thus reminding us of Nitocris' moralizing epitaph.[22] However, unlike Nitocris, Adad-Guppi is said to have died in a military camp and been buried in a secret place,[23] not over a central gateway in Babylon, and we hear nothing of any public works by her in Babylon. It is also far from clear how Adad-Guppi came to be called Nitocris by Herodotus, for "the name is . . . as unlike as possible",[24] and we cannot assume that the two women are identical.

Nitocris' building works: a dubious achievement

According to Herodotus (1. 185–186), Nitocris first excavates a reservoir and builds a containing wall around it, and then uses the

[16] Drews 1973, 181 n. 122; Ravn 1942, 90 and 101 n. 73.

[17] Cf. Beaulieu 1989, 80–81; MacGinnis 1986, 79.

[18] Röllig 1969.

[19] See above, on Semiramis, p. 68; cf. Röllig 1969, 130.

[20] H1.B in Gadd 1958, 46–56; Oppenheim in Pritchard 1969, 560–562 is a more accessible English translation.

[21] Gadd 1958, 91; Röllig 1969, 130.

[22] The death of Adad-guppi and the mourning period decreed by Nabonidus are also mentioned in the Nabonidus Chronicle (col. ii. 13–15). See Oppenheim trans. in Pritchard 1969, 306; Beaulieu 1989, 197–198.

[23] Nabonidus Chronicle ii. 13–14; H1.B iii, 5–16. Cf. Beaulieu 1989, 198; Dillery 1992, 34 n. 20.

[24] Gadd 1958, 54.

reservoir to hold the diverted waters of the Euphrates while building embankments and a bridge in Babylon. She also changes the course of the Euphrates, adding twists and turns to its path. Our notice includes all of these engineering feats—the reservoir, the quay, the bridge, and the winding river—but in a different, less logical order. Herodotus says that Nitocris slowed down the approach to Babylon in two ways: by cutting channels in the Euphrates in order to make the river wind (1. 185. 2–3) and by compelling boats to make the long circuit of the reservoir she has excavated (1. 185. 6). In his summary here, ADM carelessly combines these two factors into one, stating that Nitocris made Babylon less accessible by diverting the flow of the Euphrates into the reservoir. In Herodotus' account the queen does in fact turn the stream of the river towards her artificial lake (cf. 1. 186. 2 ἐκτρέψασα τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ ῥέεθρον πᾶν ἐς τὸ ὤρυξε χωρίον) but she does so in order to build a bridge in the center of Babylon.

In all of her building projects Nitocris maneuvers and transforms bodies of water, tampering with the natural order of things. At first sight, when Herodotus outlines Nitocris' remarkable feats (cf. ἄξιον θώματος 1. 185. 3), the memorials she has left behind (μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο 1. 185. 1; cf. 1. 186. 1), his attitude seems quite positive. The Halicarnassian is enthusiastic about similar water works elsewhere in the *History*,[25] but, as Gould well points out, the historian's attitude towards such shifting about of the boundaries of land and sea is quite complex and at times he sees such alterations as transgressions, not achievements.[26] When Xerxes digs a canal through Athos, we are told that he, like Nitocris, wishes to leave a memorial behind (μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι 7. 24). Yet Herodotus accuses him of pride and states that the project is intended by the king to display his power (δύναμιν ἀποδείκνυσθαι). Elsewhere, Xerxes' attempts to build bridges are plainly an assault on nature, of a piece with his arrogant lashing of the Hellespont (7. 25, 33–37).[27] When Cyrus cuts channels in the Gyndes, just before repeating Nitocris' feat of diverting the Euphrates, he too is asserting his power, deliberately punishing and violating the river (1. 189). Sometimes the very act of crossing a river is presented by Herodotus as a transgression, an over-

[25] See e.g. Hdt. 2. 99; 2. 101; 3. 60.
[26] Gould 1989, 106–109.
[27] Cf. Pelling 1991, 136–139.

stepping of boundaries.[28] Perhaps, then, Nitocris' engineering exploits are aggressive acts, no less provocative than her sly inscription, and the author of the *History* does not mean us to view them as altogether admirable.

The historian makes it clear, in any event, that Nitocris' impressive building feats, which are meant to keep Babylonia safe from the belligerent Medes, are ultimately a failure. The queen fears the Medes after their conquest of Nineveh and wishes to prevent them from mingling with the Babylonians and learning of her affairs. She therefore changes the course of the Euphrates, adding twists and turns to the course of the river in order to slow down access to Babylon from their direction. Nitocris' fears are justified, for Cyrus, ruler of the Medes and Persians, will in fact attack Babylon a generation later, during her son's reign. But ingenious though Nitocris' precautions may be, they make Cyrus' conquest of the city all the easier, for he uses the very reservoir excavated by the queen in order to lower the level of the Euphrates and enter Babylon (Hdt. 1. 191. 3). Nitocris' clever tactics have backfired and the queen's intelligence is directed against herself. As Saïd notes, Herodotus stresses this point not so much out of an interest in the technique of capturing cities, as in illustrating "la vanité des précautions et des manoeuvres humaines."[29]

The bridge in Babylon: Nitocris and Nebuchadnezzar

Herodotus also supplies details about Nitocris' bridge and relates that before Nitocris' reign, the Euphrates divided Babylon into two and those who wished to cross the river had to do so by boat. The queen built the bridge by diverting the Euphrates to the reservoir she had excavated, drying out the riverbed, and placing in a central spot huge stones bound together with iron and lead. During the day, Herodotus adds, Nitocris had planks of timber laid down so that people could cross the bridge; at night these planks were taken away to prevent the Babylonians from crossing and stealing from one another (1. 186). Modern commentators think that these moveable planks were intended to allow the passage of ships,[30] but it is worth noting how preoccupied the Babylonian queen is by theft. Later,

[28] See below, p. 190 on Tomyris.
[29] Saïd 1980–81, 102.
[30] Ravn 1942, 76; MacGinnis 1986, 75.

Nitocris will entice Darius to break into her tomb only to reprimand him for his hopes of easy gain, but here, she removes from the Babylonians the temptation to steal by physically removing the bridge's wooden beams. In Ctesias it is Semiramis who builds a great bridge in Babylon (*FGrH* 688 F1b. 8. 2–3). Ctesias also has Semiramis divert the Euphrates into a reservoir she has excavated in order to built an underwater passageway or tunnel which leads from one palace to another (*FGrH* 688 F1b. 9. 1–3) and Bigwood is probably right in finding this a more dramatic version of Herodotus (1. 185–186).[31] In Diodorus' summary of Ctesias we are not told why Semiramis constructs a tunnel when she already has a bridge connecting her two palaces, but there is perhaps a hint of stealth to this underground passage, just as Nitocris' bridge seems to open up the possibility of increased robbery: we are reminded of the thieves who dig a tunnel in order to reach Sardanapallus' underground treasures (Hdt. 2. 150).

In reality, the bridge in Babylon, the permanent bridge across the Euphrates, was begun by Nabopolassar and completed by his son Nebuchadnezzar,[32] while Nitocris' reservoir was the work of Nebuchadnezzar as well, for he created an artificial lake north of Babylon in the area above Sippar.[33] In his East India House Inscription, Nebuchadnezzar boasts that "to prevent an uncompromising enemy from approaching Babylon, I caused the countryside to be surrounded with waterways like the ocean,"[34] just as Nitocris is said to have dug out her reservoir for defensive purposes. The historian Abydenus, whose writings are based on those of the Babylonian priest Berossus, states that Nebuchadnezzar constructed the lake with sluice gates for irrigation and the king's water works were probably meant to fulfill both military and agricultural functions.[35] We have seen that these two concerns are divided between the two Babylonian queens of Herodotus' *History*: Semiramis is credited with embankments meant to control flooding, while Nitocris is preoccupied with the defense of her country.

In the East India House inscription quoted above, Nebuchadnezzar also speaks of defensive walls that he has built to contain the water, referring, it seems, to two walls: one from the Euphrates near Babylon

---

[31] Bigwood 1978, 38.
[32] Ravn 1942, 75–76; Baumgartner 1959, 312; Wiseman 1985, 63–64.
[33] Ravn 1942, 40–42; Bigwood 1978, 39.
[34] Quoted by Ravn 1942, 40.
[35] *FGrH* 685 F6; see Ravn 1942, 41–42.

to Kish, and another, further north, from the Euphrates at Sippar to the Tigris at Opis.[36] Thus most of the engineering works assigned here to Nitocris—the bridge, the reservoir and the quays or ramparts—are, in fact, achievements of Nebuchadnezzar and this has led scholars to suggest that Nitocris is none other than the most powerful of the neo-Babylonian kings, Nebuchadnezzar.[37] But it is difficult to understand why Nebuchadnezzar, who is not mentioned in any Greek source before Megasthenes, i.e. before the beginning of the third century BC,[38] should have taken on female guise here. Commentators speak of the "Semiramis motif"[39] or argue that Herodotus thought that "Nebuchadnezzar" was a feminine name and transformed it to the form "Nitocris" under the influence of the Egyptian queen,[40] but, as Lewy points out, it is difficult to find a parallel instance of a famous male ruler's accomplishments being assigned to a woman.[41] A closely related hypothesis is that Nitocris is Nebuchadnezzar's consort or wife.[42] This would mean that the first Labynetus, described by Herodotus as the father of Nitocris' son Labynetus (1. 188; cf. 1. 74, 77), is in reality Nebuchadnezzar. Chronologically, Nebuchadnezzar (605–562 BC) reigned shortly before Herodotus' second Labynetus, Nabonidus (556–539 BC), i.e. in the time period that the historian assigns to Nitocris, but he was not, of course, the father of Nabonidus. Later sources mention a wife of Nebuchadnezzar, Amyitis, who is the daughter of the Median ruler Astyages. Nebuchadnezzar is said to have designed the hanging gardens of Babylon for this homesick wife.[43] We have already seen that Nitocris, who has no trace of gardens in her tale, was afraid of the Medes' increasing strength, so that it is most unlikely that she was a Median princess.

The queen's inscription

Herodotus' account of Nitocris (and our notice in *DM*) can be divided into two halves: the queen's public works and her deceitful tomb

[36] Ravn 1942, 40–42; Bigwood 1978, 39.
[37] Baumgartner 1959, 312–313; cf. MacGinnis 1986, 78.
[38] Sack 1991, 31.
[39] Ravn 1942, 75; cf. Sack 1991, 78–80, 107–108.
[40] Legrand 1970, 119–120; cf. Baumgartner 1959, 313 n. 1.
[41] Lewy 1952, 265 n. 6.
[42] Ravn 1942, 76.
[43] Berossus *FGrH* 680 F7d, F8; 685 F6; cf. Diod. 2. 10. 1; Curt. Ruf. 5. 1. 35.

inscription. Commentators tend to see in the first part of her story a reflection of Babylonian history (such as Nebuchadnezzar's engineering feats), while the second part is thought to be influenced by Greek folk themes.[44] In fact, the two halves of Nitocris' tale are linked thematically, and the story of the queen's tombstone inscription is a continuation of the earlier part of her narrative. Steiner has demonstrated the close connection between carving up a landscape and carving or incising an inscription in Herodotus' accounts of Sesostris and Deioces. These Eastern monarchs treat "their lands as tablets on which they can draw the divisions and impose the topography that they wish."[45] Nitocris is another Oriental ruler who leaves her imprint both on the landscape of her country and on stone; many elements found in the description of her public works are echoed in the tale of her inscription. Thus the *way* Nitocris carves up the land, the twists and turns she introduces into the course of the Euphrates, foreshadows the devious content of her inscription, while her attempt to keep the Medes in ignorance of her affairs hints at the way she will keep Darius ignorant of what is really found in her tomb. So too Nitocris' nightly dismantling of the bridge over the Euphrates in order to prevent stealing foreshadows her desire to forestall the greedy Darius. And just as the serpentine course of the Euphrates is meant to make Babylon inaccessible to the Medes, the queen's construction of her tomb over a gateway makes that central area impassable for Darius.

Nitocris fools Darius by means of an inscription engraved on her tomb. The inscription (Hdt. 1. 187) is addressed to future rulers of Babylon and is an invitation to any needy king to open her tomb and take what he likes. A king who has no need of funds had better not (οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον) touch her grave. This inscription, quoted verbatim as it were by Herodotus, is an unusual combination of Greek and Babylonian elements, for its opening ("If one of the future kings" . . .) is reminiscent of Babylonian-Assyrian curse formulas,[46] but it closes with a very Greek phrase (οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον) associated with oracles, maledictions, and tombs.[47] It is interesting that Nitocris does not actually name herself in this epitaph and simply refers to "any

[44] Dillery 1992.
[45] Steiner 1994, 132; cf. 128–131.
[46] Baumgartner 1959, 313.
[47] Dillery 1992, 32–33.

king of Babylon after *me*" (τῶν τις ἐμεῦ ὕστερον γινομένων Βαβυλῶνος βασιλέων 1. 187. 2). Normally Babylonian rulers left their names everywhere: "A royal inscription without the king's name is an absurdity, and no less so if the inscription is a fictive one."[48] It is worth comparing, for instance, the inscription found according to Strabo, on the tomb of Cyrus the Great: ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ἐγὼ Κῦρός εἰμι, ὁ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς Πέρσαις κτησάμενος καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεύς. μὴ οὖν φθονήσῃς μοι τοῦ μνήματος.[49] This inscription also contains an admonition but Cyrus' opening words ("I am Cyrus, he who acquired the empire for the Persians . . .") are haughty and regal, quite different in tone and style from Nitocris' epitaph. Ctesias' Semiramis also carves out an inscription, one that is meant to celebrate her alleged building feats at Behistun. This marker, presumably a distortion of Darius' Behistun inscription, opens with her name and is not at all deceitful.[50]

Scholars generally deny the authenticity of Nitocris' inscription and since Nitocris' very historicity is in doubt, it is highly unlikely that the epitaph is genuine.[51] More generally this kind of inscription—a curse—is frequently found on Greek tombstones, but such maledictions are very rare at Babylonian gravesides.[52] Steiner, when discussing the gravestones of various Oriental tyrants in Herodotus, notes that the historian devalues these ostentatious graves by including some detail which either reflects the monarchs' abuse of their powers or ridicules the tyrants. We hear for instance of Alyattes and the prostitutes (1. 93. 3) or Cheops and the radishes and onions (2. 125. 6).[53] In Nitocris' case, while the emphasis seems to be on Darius' rapacity,[54] we learn something about the provocative queen's failings as well. She is clever and tricks Darius, but at the cost of having her grave disturbed.

Darius and Nitocris

Nitocris' grave remained untouched until the reign of Darius and it is ironic that Herodotus' Darius should fall victim to an inscription

---

[48] Fehling 1989, 135; cf. Ravn 1942, 13.

[49] Strabo 15. 3. 7; cf. Arrian *Anab.* 6. 29 and Plut. *Alex.* 69. 2. See Schmitt 1988, esp. 18–25 for a discussion of this inscription; he concludes that it is not authentic.

[50] *FGrH* 680 F1b. 13. 2; see on Semiramis, p. 79.

[51] Fehling 1989, 134; S. West 1985, 296; contrast Pritchett 1993, 170–173.

[52] Dillery 1992, 34.

[53] Steiner 1994, 136–138.

[54] See e.g. S. West 1985, 296.

involving a hoax, for in the *History* he himself sets up a monument and an inscription commemorating a devious deed: winning the kingdom by trickery with his horse (3. 88. 3). In two other inscriptions, the Herodotean Darius boasts of his power, listing the nations he leads in his campaign against the Scythians (4. 87) and comparing himself, the finest and noblest of men, to the Tearus river, the finest and noblest of waters (4. 91). Thus Herodotus' Persian king is well acquainted with inscriptions as a means of asserting one's dominance, but here Nitocris outstrips him with her epitaph, establishing her control well beyond the grave. The historical Darius, author of several authentic Old Persian inscriptions, acts in similar fashion. In his Behistun inscription, for example, he warns future readers of the dangers of ignoring, concealing or destroying his words.[55]

It is particularly appropriate that Darius should be the first ruler who is greedy enough to be tempted by Nitocris' promise of treasure: Herodotus tells us that his Persian subjects called Darius a "shopkeeper" or "huckster" (κάπηλος 3. 89) for he bought and sold all things.[56] Only shortly before telling of Darius plundering Nitocris' tomb, the historian reports (1. 183. 3) that Darius thought of removing a huge, solid gold statue from the Babylonian temple of Bel, but did not dare to do so. Xerxes subsequently carried off the statue, killing the priest who tried to stop him. In this earlier tale, Darius is avaricious but nonetheless respects the sanctity of the temple; presumably he too was checked by a priest and took the warning to heart. Thus when Darius violates Nitocris' grave it is not because his greed can never be curbed: it is the queen who brings the destruction of her tomb upon herself, for Herodotus tells us that it is her very inscription which spurs the king on (αὐτῶν τῶν γραμμάτων ἐπικαλεομένων 1. 187. 3).

Darius and Xerxes

The impious Xerxes features in another incident of tomb violation at Babylon, and the story bears many parallels to our tale. Aelian (*VH* 13. 3) is our source for the tale, but it is clear from Photius' brief summary that Ctesias already told of the incident (*FGrH* 688 F13. 26). Xerxes broke into the tomb of Bel and found a corpse

[55] See DB IV § 56 4. 40–43; §§ 60–61 4. 52–59; § 65 4. 69–72.
[56] Cf. Descat 1994.

immersed in oil in a crystal tub. An inscription warned that it would not be well (οὐκ ἔστιν ἄμεινον) for anyone who opened the tomb, but did not fill the tub with oil to the very top. Despite repeated efforts Xerxes was unable to fill the tub and subsequently, Aelian adds, the king did indeed come to a sorry end. The resemblances to our tale are clear: the tomb violated by a Persian king, the concept of filling or having one's fill, and the very wording of the inscription with the use of the phrase οὐκ ἄμεινον.[57] Perhaps the most interesting parallel is that the two inscriptions, while seemingly helpful, are, in fact, of no use whatsoever. Breaking into the tombs is intrinsically wrong and both inscriptions simply underline the fact: contrary to what they apparently promise, there is no way to fill the tub and there is no money to be had. The victims of these curses are in a sense random—whoever opens the grave—and neither Nitocris nor Bel have any way of knowing who the transgressor will be. Thus it seems wrong to speak of Nitocris' "revenge" against the Persian king.[58] It is perhaps not a coincidence that the two rulers have different reasons for their actions: Darius is motivated by greed, while Ctesias' Xerxes wants to *see* something; this desire to see is a feature of the Herodotean Xerxes as well.[59]

The gateway

Scholars have suggested that the gateway in Babylonia where Nitocris is buried is the Semiramis gate which Herodotus refers to at 3. 155.[60] This Semiramis gate is then identified, in turn, with the Ishtar gate which is mentioned in cuneiform sources. Remains of the Ishtar gate—with an inscription identifying it as such—have been excavated and decorative glazed brick lions have been found nearby, on the Processional Way. Consequently it has been suggested that the word λεωφόρος used by Herodotus (1. 187. 1) to describe Nitocris' gateway means "lion bearing".[61] But λεωφόρος or λαοφόρος means "people bearing", for the gateway was a busy thoroughfare, and the identification of

[57] Dillery 1992, 31–32.

[58] Cf. Flory 1987, 43; Immerwahr 1966, 92 n. 142: both mistakenly refer to *Cyrus* as the queen's victim here.

[59] καὶ ἰδεῖν ἐπεθύμησε τὸν Βελιτανᾶ τάφον *FGrH* 688 F13. 26; cf. Immerwahr 1966, 182; Konstan 1987, esp. 63–69.

[60] Cf. Pritchett 1993, 172.

[61] Baumgartner 1959, 313.

the Semiramis gate with the Ishtar gate is not certain.[62] There is no real basis to assume that the historically doubtful Nitocris was buried above the Ishtar gate. Herodotus' statement that the queen built a tomb in the gateway is in itself difficult for there is no evidence that Babylonians were accustomed to bury in city gates.[63]

The attitude displayed by Darius of the *History* towards the tomb and the gateway is also problematical. We are told, on the one hand, that Darius cannot use the gate because that would mean walking under a corpse, but the Persian king then opens the tomb, coming into even closer contact with the dead queen. Darius' reluctance to approach a corpse may well stem from Zoroastrian practices and indicate that the Persian king possessed "a true Zoroastrian sense of the impurity of a dead body."[64] Dillery argues that the original kernel of the story of Nitocris' tomb was Darius' unwillingness to walk under the gateway while the remainder of the tale—the grave plundering, treasure etc.—was concocted by Herodotus from folktale motifs, because he did not understand the incident. This explanation is more convincing than that of Waters, who suggests that the gate was "a traffic hazard,"[65] but the Zoroastrianism of Darius is still questioned by scholars.[66]

Plutarch and ADM

Plutarch has a nearly identical account of the grasping Darius plundering a tomb with a deceptive inscription, but Semiramis, not Nitocris, is the heroine of the tale.[67] Interestingly, despite the change of queens, Plutarch's wording is very similar to that of Herodotus, particularly in the queen's final rebuke. ADM's summary of the content of the inscription ἀπληστίαν πολλὴν καὶ αἰσχροκέρδειαν αὐτῷ ὀνειδίζοντα is very close to the Herodotean original: εἰ μὴ ἄπληστός τε ἔας χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδής . . . (Hdt. 1. 187) and in general, the language of our notice is quite similar to the original text of the *History*, particularly in the more technical descriptions of Nitocris' building

[62] Rollinger 1993, 138–144.
[63] Röllig 1969, 132; Dillery 1992, 34 n. 20.
[64] Boyce 1982, 112.
[65] Dillery 1992; Waters 1985, 145.
[66] See e.g. Kellens 1991.
[67] Plutarch *Mor.* 173b; cf. Stobaeus 10. 53.

works.[68] ADM also uses synonyms close to Herodotus's own wording, e.g. φρονιμωτέρα for συνετωτέρη[69] or ἀργύρια for χρήματα. In short, ADM seems to have consulted Herodotus' text firsthand and abridged it carefully and this notice is one of the strongest arguments for our anonymous author having made direct use of the sources he cites.

Foils to Persian kings

Returning to the content of Nitocris' inscription, we find that the queen accuses Darius of ἀπληστίαν, of being insatiable, reminding us of Tomyris' taunt to the similarly voracious Cyrus, who cannot get his fill of blood: ἄπληστε αἵματος Κῦρε... σε ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπληστον ἐόντα αἵματος κορέσω (Hdt. 1. 212. 2–3). Both the Persian kings are insatiable—Cyrus in his quest for blood and Darius in his greed for money—and the two queens, Tomyris and Nitocris, act as foils to these rulers, trying to constrain them and limit Persian expansionism.[70] But Tomyris is in many ways the antithesis of the "civilized", technological, and deceitful Nitocris and perhaps that is why they have different measures of success in their encounters with Persian kings. Nitocris prevents Darius from looting non-existent treasure, but Cyrus defeats her son and captures her city; Darius, of course, takes Babylon a second time. The noble savage Tomyris, on the other hand, loses her son to Cyrus' trickery, but nonetheless vanquishes the Persians and preserves her realm.

Nitocris is an elusive figure. All of the attempts to identify the Babylonian queen with an historical personage lead to difficulties of one kind or another and we cannot establish whether, in fact, she ever existed. Real or not, Nitocris is a complex, ambiguous personality whose successes and failures are inextricably linked. She builds magnificent, monumental waterworks, but these are used by Cyrus to capture her city. She tricks Darius into opening her tomb only to bring about the violation of her own grave. Nitocris is said to be

[68] Cf. τήν τε λίμνην ὀρύξαι (*DM*) and ὤρυσσε ἔλυτρον λίμνῃ (Hdt. 1. 185. 4); καὶ κρηπιδῶσαι κρηπῖδι λιθίνῃ (*DM*) and λίθους ἀγαγομένη κρηπῖδα κύκλῳ περὶ αὐτὴν ἤλασε (Hdt. 1. 185. 5).

[69] φρόνιμος is not found in Hdt., while he uses the word συνετός (in relation to people), just one more time when Darius flatters Histiaeus and calls him wise (5. 24. 3).

[70] See on Tomyris, p. 191; cf. Lateiner 1989, 137.

clever, but the queen is, in Herodotus' tale, her own worst enemy: ultimately, her building feats and artful epitaph—the outstanding products of her intelligence—do her no good.

Why did ADM choose to tell of the Babylonian queen? Partly, perhaps, because of her outstanding technical accomplishments, and partly because Herodotus makes much of her cleverness, but chiefly, it seems, because of her encounter with the Persian king. Nitocris, who manages to outwit Darius from her very grave, is, along with Tomyris, one of a series of women beloved of Greek historians, women who serve to illustrate the failures and flaws of Persian rulers. There is an implicit formula in Greek writings about Oriental courts: powerful and clever women go hand in hand with passive or ineffectual men. Strong women were often depicted by Greek authors not for their own sake, but in order to demonstrate how weak Persian kings could be undermined or out-maneuvered by mere women.[71] Thus in the original sources used by ADM, women such as Tomyris, Artemisia, or the Babylonian Nitocris are interesting chiefly in their role as foils for weak male rulers. In *DM*, though, the emphasis is reversed and the fact that our work is a collection devoted to unusual women means that it is the women who are the center of interest and the male rulers who serve as foils.

---

[71] See Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993; Brosius 1996, esp. 67, 195–198.

ARGEIA

Source: Herodotus 6. 52.
Related Sources: Herodotus 4. 147; Pausanias 3. 1. 5–9.

Herodotus' account

Herodotus is the source for this notice in *DM* and the Halicarnassian introduces this tale of Argeia and her twin sons in order to explain why the Spartans have two kings, with one royal house more important than the other. On nearly every level the story raises more questions than it answers. Scholars debate the origins, historical basis, and reasons for the diarchy in Sparta, but none accept Herodotus' account.[1] The tale itself—described by the historian as a uniquely Spartan account with which no poet agrees—is, as we shall see, neither consistent nor coherent. Herodotus' story (6. 52) begins with the death of Aristodemus, king of Sparta, shortly after his wife Argeia gave birth to twins. The Spartans wanted to follow their custom (κατὰ νόμον) and make the older child king, but were unable to distinguish between the twins. Their mother Argeia pretended not to know which of her two sons was older, in the hope that both would rule, so that the Spartans, in a quandary, consulted the oracle at Delphi. When the Pythia told them to have both twins as kings, but to respect the older more,[2] the Spartans were still unable to determine which of the two brothers was older. Finally, a Messenian named Panites recommended watching the mother and checking if she always washed and fed one of the twins before the other. Argeia did indeed consistently take care of her elder son first and he, Eurysthenes, was then recognized as first born. Eurysthenes was subsequently brought up publicly (i.e. in public or perhaps at public expense—cf. τρέφειν ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ 6. 52. 7) while the younger brother, Procles, was presumably left at home. One scholar suggests that Eurysthenes was brought up publicly so that he would not be confused with his brother

[1] See e.g. Vandiver 1991, 195–196 who surveys earlier opinions.
[2] In a late source, Diogenianus (Leutsch-Schneidewin ii, 13), we are told that the oracle replied with the proverbial phrase ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἥμισυ. Normally this expression means that embarking on a project is equivalent to finishing half of it, but here the phrase is taken to mean that Spartan rule is to be half of everything, i.e. the twins are to share the kingship.

and perhaps the scheming Argeia could not be left in charge of both her sons.[3]

Herodotus' story does not really make sense: Argeia wants both her sons to be king and consequently refuses to acknowledge the law of primogeniture, but when she takes care of her infant sons, she consistently tends the older one first. And, indeed, in doing so she behaves just as Panites expects her to: none of the parties involved can disregard the rights of the elder son.[4] The twins are identical and indistinguishable (cf. ὥστε καὶ ὁμοίων καὶ ἴσων ἐόντων), but when the Spartans observe Argeia, they are nonetheless able to tell the difference between the two and realize that she always feeds the same one first. One also wonders why Panites did not come up with his plan before the oracle was consulted, for it would have been equally effective then.[5] In addition, it is not clear why, once the oracle on the dual kingship had been given, and Argeia had achieved her essential aim of having both sons rule, she would be unwilling to reveal the identity of her older son. But none of this really matters—the dual kingship is instituted in Sparta, thanks to Argeia.

ADM as epitomator

The text of *DM* is based on a single section of Herodotus (6. 52), but the summary by ADM is not particularly lucid. He does not mention the oracle and does not make it clear that Argeia's ploy actually succeeded and that both twins were made kings even after the older one had been identified. The language of our notice is relatively sophisticated, even if it does not closely resemble Herodotus' original wording. The phrase ἀμφοτέροιν ἐξ ἴσου τὴν βασιλείαν περιθεῖναι ("to confer the throne equally upon the pair") is particularly noteworthy. This is the only dual form found in *DM*[6] and the expression τὴν βασιλείαν περιθεῖναι, while not in the Herodotean original of our passage, is found elsewhere in the *History*.[7]

---

[3] Legrand 1948, 71 n. 1.
[4] Benardete 1969, 170–171.
[5] See How and Wells 1912 ii, 83 (ad Hdt. 6. 52).
[6] The dual ἀμφοτέροιν is not in all the mss.: E3 has ἀμφοτέρων.
[7] Hdt. 1. 129; cf. 3. 81, 142.

The historical and genealogical background

When does our story take place? The supposed date of these twin kings would be around 1200 BC, but "a more realistic calculation gives... 960–930 for Eurysthenes and Prokles."[8] Argeia herself is not Spartan, but of Theban descent. *DM* simply tells us that she is descended from Polyneices, but Herodotus provides an exact genealogy, listing all her forefathers back to Polyneices: she is the daughter of Autesion, the son of Tisamenus, the son of Thersander, the son of Polyneices (6. 152; cf. 4. 147). Argeia is probably named after her great-great-grandmother, Argeia, the daughter of Adrastus, wife of Polyneices, and mother of Thersander.[9] (Argeia's name may also hint at an Argive connection. This would be genealogically useful, for the Spartan Heraclid dynasty would then go back not only to Heracles but could claim, as Argives, descent from Perseus and Acrisius as well.)[10]

Twins and brothers

In his edition Westermann postulates a lacuna in our text, a gap where *DM* originally included further genealogical information,[11] but the emphasis on Argeia's relation to Polyneices may well be deliberate. Any descendant of Polyneices would be particularly aware of the disastrous consequences of fraternal strife and Argeia's situation, in which one of her two twin sons was to become king, was bound to lead to such contention. If brothers in Greek mythology are often contrasted with and/or hostile to one another—cf. e.g. Prometheus and Epimetheus, and Atreus and Thyestes, in addition to Polyneices and Eteocles—twins often represent an even more extreme divergence. Amphion and Zethus, Hector and Polydamas have opposed natures, lifestyles, and interests. Proetus and Acrisius quarrel in the womb, like the biblical Jacob and Esau, and continue to quarrel over their birthright after they are grown.[12] Did Argeia want the kingship conferred on both her sons in order to avoid the inevitable jealousy and rivalry that would arise? If so, her plan failed, for

[8] Forrest 1968, 27.
[9] Cf. Σ ad Pi. *Ol.* 2. 76d, 81a–b.
[10] Calame 1987, 175–176; cf. Hdt. 6. 53–54.
[11] Cf. Westermann 1839, 214.
[12] See the discussion in Buxton 1994, 143–144 and cf. Dougherty 1993, 17.

Herodotus tells us that the twin brothers were always at odds with one another once they grew up (λέγουσι διαφόρους εἶναι τὸν πάντα χρόνον τῆς ζόης ἀλλήλοισι Hdt. 6. 52). It is not only Eurysthenes and Procles who are rivals: such competition between the kings of the two royal houses will be found throughout Spartan history, even when the rulers are no longer twins.

But twins need not always be competitors: we hear, for instance, of twin kings in Lydia who rule together peaceably and successfully, until others plot against them.[13] In fact, the two kings of Sparta are often linked with mythological twin brothers who work together as a team, Castor and Pollux. The kings of the two Spartan royal houses are at one and the same time "les successeurs lointains, les protégés et les représentants sur terre" of the Dioscuri.[14] There is a certain mystique attached to the twinship or duality of Argeia's sons which leaves its mark on the many double features—double portions, double votes, double messengers—subsequently granted each of the two kings in the Spartan diarchy.[15] The twin brothers, Eurysthenes and Procles, are also said in later sources to have married twin sisters and their marriage, like their joint kingship, follows a consultation of the oracle at Delphi.[16]

Argeia's accomplishment

At first sight, it is difficult to understand why Argeia is included in *DM*. She is a queen, but certainly does not rule on her own. Herodotus tell us that after Aristodemus dies, Argeia's brother Theras acts as regent for his twin nephews (4. 147). (Theras, an interesting instance of a powerful mother's brother, will leave Sparta when the boys grow up, finding it unbearable to be ruled by others after having tasted power.)[17] Like many other women in our composition, Argeia comes to the fore after the death of her husband (cf. μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός *DM*).[18] She is known solely for one independent action—her

[13] Cf. καὶ ὁμοῦ ἐβασίλευον ἀμφότεροι στέργοντες ἀλλήλους καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους στεργόμενοι *FGrH* 90 F44. 1 and see Slater 1968, 381–383 on amicable twins in Greek myth.

[14] Carlier 1984, 298.

[15] See Benardete 1969, 172; Carlier 1984, 297–301.

[16] Pausanias 3. 16. 6; Aelian *NA* 12. 31; cf. Parke and Wormell 1956, i 84.

[17] See Bremmer 1983, esp. 180; Dougherty 1983, 17.

[18] Elsewhere Aristodemus is said to have died before the Dorian invasion (see e.g.

attempt to keep the identity of her older son secret. Had Aristodemus not died when the twins were babies, it would have been clear who was the elder and the queen would never have been consulted. The queen plots to ensure the kingship for both her children by using deception, but is caught out in her lie. She is not clever and if anything, we are meant—in Herodotus' text—to admire the plan devised by the otherwise unknown Messenian, Panites.[19] Herodotus tells us that Argeia does not understand why she is being watched when caring for the twins, and we have seen that she reveals the truth by observing the very custom or law which she is trying to circumvent, the law of primogeniture. Both her sons are to be kings because of the decision of the oracle, not because of Argeia's own actions. Nonetheless her plan ultimately succeeds: by refusing to distinguish between her two children, Argeia does manage to confer the kingship on both. Dewald points out how women in Herodotus often have to choose carefully between difficult courses of action—e.g. Sesostris' wife chooses to sacrifice two children to save the rest of her family (2. 107) and the wife of Intaphrenes chooses to keep her brother alive (3. 119)—but Argeia achieves her aims precisely because she will not choose.[20] She is surrounded by powerful and clever men—her brother Theras, the Spartan leaders, and Panites—and is out-maneuvered by them, but nonetheless manages to have her way.

If the women of *DM* are notable chiefly for their role in the preservation and transmission of power, then Argeia—no matter how unlikely or unhistorical her tale actually is—is perhaps one of the most important heroines of all. Her one act of deception, which triggered the oracle on dual kingship, not only led to both her children gaining the throne, but to the creation of the Spartan diarchy, which lasted for over 500 years. Viewed in this light, Argeia had a strong and lasting effect on the perpetuation of power in Sparta and that, it seems, is why she is featured in *DM*.

Apollodorus 2. 8. 2), and it is only according to the Spartans' account that Aristodemus, rather than his sons, led the Spartans to their territory.

[19] Cf. ἐφόδῳ in *DM*. Christ 1994, 183–184 thinks that Hdt. is interested in Panites' experiment not only as a clever stratagem, but as a demonstration of rational inquiry.

[20] Dewald 1981, 108–109; cf. 94 on the fraternal strife caused in Sparta when a queen is infertile (Hdt. 5. 39, 6. 61).

Dido

Source: Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F82 (= *DM* 6); cf. Müller *FHG* i, 197, fr. 23.
Related Sources: Justin 18. 4. 1–18. 6. 8; Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 43; Eustathius *Comm. in Dionysii Periegetae orbis descriptionem* 195 (*GGM* ii, 250–251); Virgil *Aeneid* 1. 338–368; 4. 20–21, 35–38, 655–56; Menander of Ephesus *FGrH* 783 F1; Appian *Libyca* 1–2.[1]

Timaeus' Dido

It is virtually impossible to think of Dido without Virgil's creation, the tragic heroine of the *Aeneid*, coming to mind. But the Dido found in *DM*, Timaeus' Theiosso or Elissa, is clearly not identical with Virgil's figure. The female founder of Carthage described by Timaeus was unacquainted with Aeneas and died a loyal wife to her first husband; according to the historian's reckoning she lived long after the Trojan war. The Dido depicted by Timaeus, while overshadowed by Virgil's heroine, was nonetheless a famous figure in her own right, and was celebrated over the centuries—most notably for her chastity—by many writers.[2] Our notice is interesting precisely because it provides evidence for the earliest known account of the "other" Dido, the story of the Phoenician queen current before Virgil linked her romantically with Aeneas and refashioned her tale, time, and image.[3]

DM is the sole source for Timaeus' version of events,[4] which was written towards the middle of the third century BC, and seems to

---

[1] See the further references in Huss 1985, 40 n. 13.

[2] Lord 1969 surveys literary writings on the chaste Dido, from Timaeus onwards.

[3] See Hexter 1992 for an intriguing (and exceptionally well-documented) reading of Virgil's Dido by means of—and in contrast to—the traditional portrait of the queen. For the likelihood that Naevius included in his *Bellum Punicum* an encounter (romantic or otherwise) between Aeneas and Dido even before Virgil, see e.g. Horsfall 1990, 139–144 and the further references there. Ancient sources already noted the chronological difficulties created by a meeting between Dido and Aeneas—see e.g. Servius on *Aen.* 1. 267—and at times chided Virgil for transforming the queen (*Anth. Pal.* 16, 151).

[4] Commentators sometimes speak of a note on the margins—or at the end—of Book 8 of a ms. of Polyaenus' *Strategemata*, as if it were an additional, independent source for Timaeus' account (Lord 1969, 33; Hexter 1992, 367 n. 35; cf. Kowalski 1929, 4). But this note is—to judge by Müller's text (*FHG* i, 197, fr. 23)—virtually identical with the *DM* notice and since the whole of *DM* is found almost immedi-

have been the first account of Dido in a Greek history.[5] Timaeus' story of the Carthaginian queen may have some historical basis. The historian from Tauromenium claims to have gone to the expense and trouble of consulting Tyrian or Phoenician records of some kind (παρὰ Τυρίων ὑπομνήματα); these records were apparently translated for him.[6] We shall see that a small portion of Timaeus' tale is substantiated by the independent, Phoenician-based evidence of Menander of Ephesus.

There are several later sources which correspond well with the brief summary of Timaeus' account provided here by ADM and these sources must be based (directly or indirectly) upon the Sicilian historian. A closer look at these sources, in particular Justin's third or fourth century AD epitome of the *Philippica* by the Greek Augustan historian, Pompeius Trogus, will allow us to supplement the condensed account given by *DM* and sketch a fuller picture of the pre-Virgilian Dido. Justin's epitome cannot, however, be taken as an exact reproduction of Timaeus' account and it is likely that the two writers diverged at times.[7]

Elissa's family

According to Justin, Mutto,[8] the king of Tyre, named both his son Pygmalion and his daughter Elissa[9] heirs to his throne. Despite the king's wishes, Justin adds, the people of Tyre preferred Pygmalion as

ately after the text of Polyaenus in several mss. (see above intro., p. 4), this must refer simply to the text of *DM*.

[5] See Asheri 1991–2, 64. Kowalski 1929, 6–17 thinks that Ctesias is Timaeus' source for Dido, but if that were the case, one would, perhaps, have expected ADM to have made direct use of Ctesias here, just as he does for the notices on Zarinaea and Semiramis.

[6] *FGrH* 566 T19, F7 = Polybius 12. 28–29a. There is a textual problem here and the reading Τυρίων is not altogether certain. See Walbank 1967, 411–412 (ad Polyb. 12. 28a3); Asheri 1991–2, 63–65 with n. 18; and compare Jacoby ad *FGrH* 566 F82 (iii b (text), 574). Huss 1985, 41–42 is skeptical about the historical value of Justin's (and consequently Timaeus') account.

[7] See Jacoby ad *FGrH* 566 F82 (iii b (notes), 337 n. 412).

[8] Elsewhere Elissa's father is named Mettes (Servius on *Aen.* 1. 343) or Μέττηνος (Menander *FGrH* 783 F1); the name is Mattan in Phoenician—cf. Aubet 1993, 187. Dido is also called the daughter of Belus (cf. *Aen.* 1. 619–623), but this may be a dynastic title of the Tyrian king, rather than the name of the deity Baal. See Austin 1971, 192 on *Aen.* 1. 621; Kowalski 1929, 10–11; Huss 1985, 41 n. 16; Honeyman 1947, 79.

[9] Justin refers to Dido as Elissa throughout this section of his work (18. 4–6; cf. 11. 10. 13); the queen's various names will be discussed below.

sole ruler and Elissa, who seems to have acquiesced peaceably, marries. It is noteworthy that Elissa was supposedly named as heir along with her brother; in the list of Tyrian kings recorded by Menander (*FGrH* 783 F1), there is no instance of a woman ruler or co-regent. Perhaps the Tyrian princess displayed her qualities of leadership—or Pygmalion his wickedness—at an early age. Elissa was, it seems, related to two other strong-minded Phoenician women, for she was the grand niece of the biblical Jezebel and consequently a cousin of Jezebel's daughter Athalia, a powerful queen who would not be out of place in *DM*.[10]

Elissa, Justin tells us, married her uncle Acherbas, a priest of Heracles (i.e. Melqart), a man second in importance only to Pygmalion. Acherbas—who was also known as Sicharbas or Sychaeus: all these names are variations on Hasdrubal or Zakarbaal—[11] is exceptionally wealthy but keeps his gold well hidden. Pygmalion who hears of his riches, murders his brother-in-law, but does not manage to acquire his gold. Virgil adds further details to Justin's account, details which the poet may have invented himself. The author of the *Aeneid* (1. 343–359) has Sychaeus killed at the very altars of his house. When Pygmalion tries to conceal his crime from Dido, her dead husband warns her of her brother's treachery in a dream. Most interesting of all, Virgil may have been acquainted with a tradition that Sychaeus was a *brother* of Pygmalion (and consequently of Dido), rather than their uncle, for he speaks of *fraterna caede*, the killing of a brother (*Aen.* 4. 21).[12] While this may be no more than a loose use of the term *fraternus* to include a brother-in-law, incest (found in conjunction with violent death or suicide) is a regular motif in Phoenician tales of the founders of cities[13] so that in some versions of her tale, Elissa was, perhaps, married to her brother. One scholar notes the parallels between the chaste Dido's story and the tale of Isis as reported by Diodorus Siculus (1. 21–22): Isis is married to her brother, who is killed by another brother; she avenges his murder, becomes queen of Egypt and vows never to marry again.[14] We cannot be

[10] See the genealogical table in Harden 1962, 53 and see Aubet 1993, 38 and 44.
[11] See Servius on *Aen.* 1. 343; Pease 1935, 103–4 (ad *Aen.* 4. 20); Huss 1985, 41 with n. 17; Aubet 1993, 131.
[12] Compare *fraterno crimine* Sil. *Pun.* 1. 21–23 and see Visser 1986, 155; Pease 1935, 104 (on *Aen.* 4. 21).
[13] Grottanelli 1972.
[14] Hexter 1992, 378 n. 102.

certain of the family relationship between Dido and her (unnamed) husband in Timaeus' original account: it is likely that he was her uncle, as in Justin, but he *may* have been her brother. We have seen that Dido's situation closely resembles that of another woman in *DM*, the Egyptian Nitocris (above, p. 104). Nitocris' husband was her sibling, and, if that is true of Dido as well, the particular combination of natal and conjugal links these women had with their spouses would explain the fierce loyalty displayed by both queens.

In some sources, Dido has yet another sibling, Anna, and this sister is—like Pygmalion—portrayed, at times, as a rival. Anna is regularly found in the context of the queen's romance with Aeneas; Naevius was, it seems, the first writer to mention her. In the *Aeneid* Anna serves as Dido's foil and confidante, but Virgil also hints at competition between the two sisters for Aeneas' affections (cf. *Aen.* 4. 421–423). Elsewhere Anna is said to have loved Aeneas, and in some accounts she follows him to Latium and subsequently commits suicide. Anna was not mentioned by any Greek author before the 12th century AD Eustathius—who says that she is identical with Dido—and she does not appear at all in versions telling of the chaste queen. Timaeus, then, did not include a sister in his account.[15]

The flight from Tyre

Returning to Justin, we find that Elissa claims that she wishes to return to her brother Pygmalion's house after her husband's death, while actually arranging to leave Tyre together with a group of leading Phoenicians who are unhappy with her brother's rule. Pygmalion, thinking that Elissa will be coming to his house with Acherbas' gold, sends servants to help her with the move. She has these servants cast bags of sand into the sea, pretending that they contain her husband's money: Elissa even addresses the dead Acherbas, praying that he accept the gold. She then frightens Pygmalion's servants into joining her expedition and flees Tyre (Justin 18. 4. 9–15).

Elissa's departure from Tyre is recorded by the historian Menander of Ephesus who states that in the seventh year of Pygmalion's reign, his sister fled and founded Carthage in Libya. Menander of Ephesus

---

[15] See Serv. Dan. on *Aen.* 4. 9; Serv. on *Aen.* 4. 682, 5. 4; Ovid *F.* 3. 523–696; Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 8. 39–201; Pease 1935, 49–50; Hexter 1992, 376–377 n. 92; Lord 1969, 39, 41.

is said to be quoting from the Tyrian annals and these Phoenician chronicles are cited by Josephus for their antiquity and accuracy.[16] Scholars making use of Biblical and Assyrian data assign the seventh year of Pygmalion's reign to the last quarter of the ninth century,[17] and happily enough this date is in accordance with one supplied by Timaeus himself. Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us that the Sicilian historian synchronized the foundation of Carthage with that of Rome and dated them both to 38 years before the first Olympiad (i.e. 814–813 BC).[18] Many ancient historians adopted Timaeus' date and modern archaeological findings allow that Carthage was indeed founded at about this time.[19]

Phoenician greed and trickery

Dido, who has taken her husband's money with her, becomes wealthy and her gold is almost invariably a part of her story, as we can see from the phrase "she placed her money" (ἐνθεμένη τὰ χρήματα) in our notice and from references in other writers as well.[20] Virgil mentions *argenti pondus et auri* (*Aen.* 1. 359) when telling of Dido's escape from Tyre and he frequently refers to the wealth of the queen and her city.[21] In later sources we hear of the quest for Dido's gold: Nero supposedly searches for the queen's hidden treasure.[22] This emphasis on the queen's riches is probably related to the avarice or love of luxury often attributed to the Carthaginians and Phoenicians by ancient writers.[23] From Homer onwards, the Phoenicians had a reputation for greediness and sharp trading. In what may be the earliest instance of a barbarian stereotype in Greek literature, Odysseus

---

[16] Menander of Ephesus *FGrH* 783 F1 = Josephus *Contra Apionem* 1. 125; cf. *Ant.* 8. 144 and Asheri 1991–2, 63. Aubet 1993, 22–25 discusses Phoenician historiography.

[17] Huss 1985, 41; Asheri 1991–92, 64–65 with n. 19.

[18] Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 74. 1 = *FGrH* 566 F60.

[19] Harden 1962, 66; cf. Aubet 1993, 187–190 for an analysis of Greek and Oriental elements in Timaeus' tale. For other ancient traditions on the founding of Carthage see Huss 1985, 40, 42; Asheri 1991–92, 66–67 etc.

[20] Compare *multo auri et argenti pondere congregato* (Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 43); μετὰ χρημάτων πολλῶν Appian *Libyca* 1; συναραμένη δὲ καὶ τὰ χρήματα Eustathius *Comm. in Dionys. Perieg.* 195 (*GGM* ii, 251).

[21] See *Aen.* 4. 138–139, 263–4 and the further references collected by Pease 1935, 150 (on *opes* 4. 75).

[22] Suet. *Nero* 31–32; Tac. *Ann.* 16. 1.

[23] Cf. Horsfall 1990, esp. 135; Hexter 1992, 345–346 and 356.

tells of a sly Phoenician merchant who supposedly wants to sell him into slavery (*Od.* 14. 288–297; cf. 15. 415–416).[24] Sophocles (fr. 823 N. = 909 R.) also knows of mercenary Phoenicians and in Herodotus (4. 196) we find the Carthaginians engaging in dumb barter with more primitive peoples, exchanging goods for gold and, we may safely assume, getting the better of the deal.[25] Timaeus himself speaks of greedy Carthaginians.[26] Indeed Dido's very act of vengeance upon Pygmalion, taking the treasure (and founding a new, wealthy city), rather than killing her brother, seems to show what Phoenician priorities were supposed to be. "Dido knew . . . just where to strike in order to make her enemy pay . . . not death, but lifelong desolation."[27]

Another, even more notorious quality of the Carthaginians was their deviousness and bad faith, the infamous *fides Punica*—Greeks spoke of the proverbial ψεῦδος Φοινικικόν or Φοινίκων συνθῆκαι—and such craftiness is, in fact, the most prominent feature of Justin's tale of Elissa.[28] Time and again, the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, and most notably the queen herself, make use of various maneuvers and stratagems in their dealings. All the major characters we have encountered so far have indulged in deception and trickery: Acherbas hides his gold; Pygmalion hides his evil deed; Dido pretends to be fooled by her brother; she then casts sand into the sea instead of gold. This last ploy, declaring sand to be gold, is of course meant to deceive Pygmalion, but Dido may intend to fool her husband's shade as well!

The next bit of sharp dealing in Justin's account comes when Elissa and her compatriots reach Carthage. (They have stopped on the way at Cyprus, where a priest, his family, and some 80 virgins join their expedition. This is apparently one of the many wanderings briefly referred to in our text- cf. τὴν πολλὴν αὐτῆς πλάνην). When she arrives

---

[24] Hall 1989, 49 n. 158.

[25] Warmington 1964, 73–74; he thinks that such trading was the basis of much Carthaginian wealth.

[26] See e.g. *FGrH* 566 F106 (= Diod. 13. 108. 4). Plutarch *Tim.* 29 and Diod. 13. 57. 3–5; 14. 76. 3–4 are further descriptions of Carthaginian avarice which in all likelihood stem from Timaeus- see Pearson 1987, 153, 183, and 222.

[27] Visser 1986, 155; cf. Servius on *Aen.* 4. 656 *et re vera nulla avari maior est poena quam amittere pecuniam.*

[28] Cf. Kowalski 1929, 4–5. For Dido and *fides Punica* see also Hexter 1992, 345, 350, 371–372, nn. 58–59; Pease 1935, 283–284 (on *Aen.* 4. 305); Horsfall 1990, esp. 134; Scheid and Svenbro 1985. Prandi 1979 is a useful collection of passages demonstrating ancient prejudice against the Carthaginians; Morris 1992, 377–381 points to a more ambiguous portrayal of the Phoenicians in Greek writings.

in Africa, Dido bargains with the local inhabitants and agrees to pay for the amount of territory that can be covered by an oxhide. She then cuts the hide into very thin strips in order to cover as wide an area as possible.[29] This area is subsequently known as Byrsa (from the Greek βύρσα, hide) and is the starting point for the Phoenicians' colony in Carthage. Such a Greek etymology in a Phoenician-Punic context is, of course, surprising and *byrsa* is thought to be a Semitic word for acropolis or fortress.[30] Elissa and her companions trade with the local inhabitants and are contacted by fellow Phoenicians who have settled in Utica. They decide to found a city, Carthage, and move their settlement to a more propitious site, where a horse's head, symbolizing the future wealth and might of the city, has been found.[31]

A marriage proposal

The Carthaginians flourish and this leads to yet another stratagem described by Justin; this deception is directed against Elissa herself. A local African king, Hiarbas—or in non-aspirated form, Iarbas—wishes to wed Elissa: her refusal, he threatens, will lead to war.[32] From Virgil we learn that Dido's suitor Iarbas is the son of a nymph and Hammon, the Phoenician Jupiter. In the *Aeneid* (4. 198–218), the barbarian king is a fierce and frightening figure, who offers sacrifices to his divine father at a hundred great temples and altars, and we may assume that the earlier Iarbas of Timaeus was equally formidable.[33] Ten leading Carthaginians, Justin continues, are sent to inform the queen of Iarbas' proposal (and accompanying threat), but they are afraid to broach the subject directly. Instead they rather ingeniously (cf. *Punico . . . ingenio* Justin 18. 6. 2) pretend that the king has asked for someone to teach him civilized ways, but add that no

---

[29] See Appian *Lybica* 1–2 and Eustathius *Comm. in Dion. Perieg.* 195 (*GGM* ii, 251) for a more detailed account; cf. Virgil *Aen.* 1. 365–368; 4. 211–212. Pease 1935, 232–233 (ad *Aen.* 4. 211) lists further sources and parallel tales from other cultures; see too the analysis of Scheid and Svenbro 1985.

[30] See Moscati 1968, 115; Harden 1962, 67; cf. Lancel 1995, 24–25. Bilingual wordplay is often found in tales of the foundation of colonies—see Dougherty 1993, 45–60, 158. Dougherty's analysis of Greek "colonial discourse" can be applied to much of Elissa's tale here.

[31] Cf. *Aen.* 1. 441–5; Eustathius *GGM* ii, 251.

[32] In Justin, Iarbas rules the Maxitani, while in our text (and Jerome) he is king of the Libyans—see Pease 1935, 224 (on *Aen.* 4. 196) for various other African tribes over whom he is said to have ruled.

[33] Cf. Lord 1969, 40–41.

one is willing to leave his kin and live with the barbarians. When Dido reproaches them for putting their country at risk and urges them to make the sacrifice, they tell her to practice what she preaches. In this fashion the queen, in Justin's account, was tricked into accepting Iarbas (cf. *hoc dolo capta* 18. 6. 5). Was this story—in which the subtle and sophisticated Punic settlers look down upon the primitive native inhabitants, the Libyans—in Timaeus' history as well? Elsewhere Timaeus often portrays the *Carthaginians* as barbarians (below, p. 134). In *DM* we are told that Dido was compelled by her compatriots to marry the local king (ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν πολιτῶν συναναγκαζομένη), and in all likelihood this is simply a reference to their trap in Justin. But it is possible that Timaeus' Carthaginians were more vehement and used more forceful tactics to persuade their queen.

Dido's suicide

When Dido is forced to accept Iarbas' proposal, she reacts just as she has done when Pygmalion murdered her husband. She does not confront her opponents directly, but pretends to comply with their wishes while secretly proceeding with a plan of her own. Thus the queen neither argues with her fellow Phoenicians nor attempts to harm Iarbas in any way; instead she plans her funeral pyre. If earlier Dido has managed to escape Pygmalion's clutches, harm him financially, and eventually found a rival city, here her secret, alternative plan is less auspicious. The queen outwits Iarbas and her fellow Carthaginians and does not accept their dictates, but does so at the cost of her own life. Unlike the Egyptian Nitocris—who also deceives those who surround her and commits suicide—Dido dies alone and does not, for instance, maneuver Iarbas into joining her on the funeral pyre. The queen of Carthage was a courageous, independent, and intelligent leader while alive, but she dies very much a female, a woman compelled to surrender to a more powerful male. Dido's suicide is perhaps her most memorable and impressive act in all the various versions of her tale, but the deed transforms her from a warrior queen into a woman. She does not, as many male rulers do, commit suicide because she has been defeated on the battlefield, but kills herself in order to avoid an unwelcome marriage.

The queen's dramatic suicide is the final instance of deceit described in Justin's narrative. Here we find the first reference in our text, *DM*, to deception on the part of the queen, for Dido allegedly

prepares the pyre as part of a rite to annul her vows (σκηψαμένη τελετήν τινα πρὸς ἀνάλυσιν ὅρκων ἐπιτελέσειν), thus hiding her intention to kill herself. In his account, Justin makes it quite plain that the vows to be annulled are those of loyalty to her dead husband, for he relates that Elissa weeps and calls Acherbas' name aloud when she is told that she must marry Iarbas. Her pyre is supposedly intended for sacrifices to appease her dead husband's shade, and when the conflagration is ready she takes a sword, utters a final ironic remark about going to her husband in accordance with her people's wishes, ascends the pyre, and kills herself. This is the devoted and chaste Dido who, as Tertullian and Jerome put it, would rather burn than marry.[34] The suicidal queen is often cited by Christian writers as a model figure, an outstanding *univira* and she frequently appears as one of a series of *exempla* of ideal, chaste women who refuse to marry or remarry.[35]

A political death?

We have assumed thus far that Justin (or, to be more precise, Pompeius Trogus) reflects or reproduces the essence of Timaeus' account: was this devoted and loyal Dido already found in the work of the Sicilian historian? Up until her suicide, Dido is a compelling figure, but she is not outstandingly moral and it is somewhat surprising that the Sicilian Timaeus should grant the Carthaginian queen such a virtuous and noble end.[36] Timaeus was not a great admirer of his country's arch enemies, the Carthaginians, and elsewhere in his work he frequently avails himself of the opportunity to paint them in black colors.[37] We have already seen that the Sicilian historian assigns to Dido many of the negative stereotypes associated with the Carthaginians: the queen is resourceful, independent, and courageous, but she is at the same time duplicitous, greedy, and sly. Thus it is possible that in Timaeus' account Dido's death is less selfless and noble

[34] Tertullian *De Monogamia* 17; Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 43. This is a playful variation on "It is better to marry than to burn" (I *Cor.* 7. 9)—see Lord 1969, 27–30 and the further references there.

[35] On Dido as *univira* see Pease 1935, 66 n. 498 and Lord 1969, esp. 26–27. For the use of the term *univira* by Roman and Christian writers and their attitudes towards such women, see Pease 1935, 111–112 (on *Aen.* 4. 29); Monti 1981, 53–55; Rudd 1990, 154–159 etc.

[36] Cf. Jacoby ad *FGrH* 566 F82 (iii b (text), 575).

[37] See e.g. Pearson 1987, 153, 163, and 250.

than in later sources and her suicide may stem from several complex motives. The fact that the queen kills herself rather than marry the barbarian king makes it clear that she did not wish to wed again, but loyalty to her dead husband need not have been her sole (or even chief) reason for refusing to remarry. While Timaeus' Dido *may* have sworn to remain loyal to her husband—ADM, the only direct source for the Sicilian historian's version, speaks only of ὅρκων and does not specify which vows Dido allegedly wishes to nullify—these oaths could have been a mere pretext for going to her death. (Earlier, when fleeing Tyre, Dido has made similar pragmatic use of her dead husband, addressing his shade with great emotion, but actually offering it sand, not gold.) Perhaps Timaeus' queen really killed herself because marrying Iarbas would mean relinquishing her independence and sovereignty over Carthage and *that* was the situation she could not face. In Virgil, Dido is swept away by passion, but she is also influenced by political considerations, for when she reproaches Aeneas and hints at suicide, she mentions the possibility that Pygmalion will destroy her city or Iarbas take her as a wife (*Aen.* 4. 323–326). "The implication is that she would rather kill herself than fall prey to her political enemies."[38]

Thus the chaste figure portrayed by Justin and praised by Jerome could well be a later variation on—or distortion of—Timaeus' original heroine. Here it is illuminating to compare the tale of another famous Carthaginian woman who is often linked with Dido, Hasdrubal's wife. She too leaps into a pyre and in earlier accounts, she does so because she is shamed by her husband's willingness to accept defeat and to surrender to the Romans. Later, the suicide of Hasdrubal's wife is transformed by Jerome and other Christian authors into the act of a virtuous, chaste woman who cannot bear to live without her husband.[39] If Christian writers saw in Dido a chaste widow who abstained from a second marriage, earlier pagan authors such as Justin's source, Pompeius Trogus, may have been influenced by tales of mythological widows who were unwilling to continue living once their husbands have died, for "in myth woman is expected to link her own fate to that of the beloved man."[40] In other words,

---

[38] Monti 1981, 40; cf. 69.

[39] See e.g. Polybius 38. 20. 7–10 vs. Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 43; Lord 1969, 35–37 has further discussion and references.

[40] van Hooff 1990, 103. Cf. e.g. Evadne of Euripides' *Supplices* and Xenophon's Panthea and see Gera 1993, 243–244.

even if Timaeus' Dido committed suicide because she did not want to relinquish her rule over Carthage, this would be an unusual and unexpected reason for a widow to kill herself, and her behavior could have been assimilated very quickly to the more usual pattern of a grief-stricken widow who hastens to be united with her husband in death. By all accounts, Dido was in no great hurry to join the dead Sychaeus and she accomplishes a great deal on her own before joining him. Even Jerome (*Against Jovinian* 1. 43) has the queen postpone her wedding to Iarbas (and her resulting suicide) in order to strengthen her city.

Funeral pyres

Whatever the reasons Timaeus gives for Dido killing herself, there is little doubt that the historian, who did not always stick closely to the truth,[41] described the deed in a sensational and dramatic way and Dido's suicide is a rather spectacular affair. For a start, she uses two weapons to kill herself: sword and fire. (Our brief text mentions just the pyre, but the sword is found in Justin, Virgil etc.) Normally, women do not use a sword to commit suicide, but resolute mythological heroines do make use of such weapons.[42] Once she had decided upon a sword, a simple thrust of the weapon would have sufficed to despatch Dido to her demise, and she need not have undertaken the lengthy preparation (and deception!) entailed by the erection of a pyre.[43] But the Carthaginian queen apparently wished to die publicly and ostentatiously, and she uses her funeral pyre to achieve this effect. We find this concern in Virgil as well: his Dido engages in complicated magical procedures whose sole function is to deceive Anna while she arranges her pyre.[44] In the *Aeneid* the Carthaginian queen's fiery end seems related to the flaming passions she experiences throughout her love affair with Aeneas. Virgil uses a great deal of fire imagery to depict Dido's state and his heroine's soul burns long before her body is enveloped in flames.[45]

---

[41] See the lengthy complaints of Polybius (*FGrH* 566 T19).

[42] See van Hooff 1990, 49–50.

[43] Garrison 1991, 11–12 notes that in the Greek world burial by fire was sometimes not permitted suicides, who were inhumed. Did Dido wish to ensure herself cremation?

[44] Horsfall 1990, 136.

[45] See e.g. Rudd 1990, 164.

We can assume that Timaeus also dwelt on the flames of Dido's pyre, if in less literary fashion. The Sicilian historian was notoriously fond of fires and mentioned them several times in conjunction with Carthaginians.[46] Dido's conflagration reminds scholars of several similar funeral pyres—we have already mentioned that of Hasdrubal's wife—and two of these are particularly interesting in relation to our story.[47] Ctesias tells of the pyre erected by "eat, drink, and be merry" Sardanapallus, who carefully arranges his own death, along with that of his wife, mistresses, and servants. The wealthy monarch also adds vast quantities of gold and silver to the fire, to be burned along with himself and the members of his household.[48] It is tempting to conjecture that Dido used her funeral pyre to similar purpose, finally going to her husband with his gold. This would be an elegant form of vengeance, serving to punish both Iarbas, who presumably was after the queen's wealth (as well as her person and her city), and Dido's own subjects who insisted upon her marrying the barbarian king. While there is no evidence that Dido included precious material goods in her pyre, Sardanapallus' end indicates that such a practice was not unknown. The second noteworthy death by fire is that of a later Carthaginian chief, Hamilcar. Herodotus (7. 167) reports a Carthaginian tradition according to which the military leader was offering sacrifices during the course of a battle when he realized that his side had been defeated: he then jumped into the flames. Hamilcar, we are told, is subsequently honored by the Carthaginians with sacrifices and monuments. Justin (18. 6. 8) tells us that Dido herself was similarly worshipped as a deity after her death and she has been identified with the Phoenician goddesses Astarte and Tanit.[49] One argument used to grant Dido divine status is that scholars find it difficult to believe that a *woman* supposedly led the Phoenicians in their emigration to a new colony: a female, they contend, is unlikely to be the principal figure in a foundation myth.[50] But women are associated with the origin of certain Greek colonies—Cyrene, the

---

[46] See *FGrH* 566 F112; Diod. 11. 22; 14. 73; 20. 67 and cf. Pearson 1987, 242 with n. 117 and 250.

[47] Kowalski 1929, 11 n. 3 and 14; Pease 1935, 512 (ad *Aen.* 4. 661).

[48] *FGrH* 688 F1b 27. 2; F1q. Compare Boges (Hdt. 7. 107) who erects a great pyre for his wife, children, mistresses, and servants. Before leaping to his own death, he carefully disperses all his gold and silver from the city wall.

[49] For Dido as a divine figure see Pease 1935, 22; cf. Hexter 350–352 and 375 n. 82.

[50] Bunnens 1986, 123; cf. Huss 1985, 41–42.

eponymous founder of the Libyan city is one such instance—[51] and *DM* itself provides the example of Onomaris who also leads a group of emigrants and founds a new settlement. Since ADM does not appear to be interested in goddesses or mythological women (above, p. 11), we can assume that Timaeus' Elissa did not start out a goddess, whatever her eventual fate.

The death by fire of these Carthaginian figures—Dido, Hamilcar, and Hasdrubal's wife—may be related to the Phoenician and Punic practice of human sacrifice.[52] Carthaginians were notorious for their sacrifice of humans, particularly children, and Greeks knew of these acts.[53] Timaeus mentions this practice several times and while he may have exaggerated the extent of the offerings, archaeological finds indicate that there were indeed such sacrifices.[54] It has been suggested that the most important religious site in Carthage, the *topheth*, where human sacrifices, chiefly of children, took place was located at the very spot where Elissa landed and died.[55] It would be truly ironic if Dido's suicide, so widely admired by Christian writers, served to establish the location of a particularly pagan and inhumane practice.

Dido's names

What is behind Dido's various names? Even our brief notice makes it plain that Timaeus was interested in the Carthaginian queen's different names and their meanings, and his interest in such etymologies was shared by other ancient writers. Both ancient and modern commentators state that the Phoenician name Elissa was the queen's original appellation and the name Dido became associated with her later on.[56] Timaeus' Theiosso is apparently meant to be a

---

[51] See Cantarella 1987, 19–20 and 190 nn. 13–14; Dougherty 1993, 136–156.

[52] Grottanelli 1972, 327; Lancel 1995, 24.

[53] See e.g. Sophocles fr. 122 N. (= 126 R.); [Plato] *Minos* 315b; Brown 1991, 21–26 has further references. Lancel 1995, 252 notes that major ancient historians—such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, and Livy—are surprisingly silent about the practice.

[54] For Timaeus, see Diod. 13. 86. 3; 20. 14. 4–7; 20. 65. 1; Pearson 1987, 163, 244 n. 122 and 250. Lancel 1995, 227–256 is a thorough discussion of the excavations at the *tophet* of Carthage and the archaeological evidence for child sacrifice; see too Brown 1991.

[55] Moscati 1968, 142, 150; Lancel 1995, 24; cf. Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 4. 765 ff.

[56] See the references collected by Pease 1935, 300 (on *Aen.* 4. 335); Warmington 1964, 23; Moscati 1968, 115.

Greek equivalent of the Phoenician name Elissa: El means god, θεός. It has been suggested that the -issa component signifies either "fire", referring to Dido's end or "woman", indicating that Dido is a female deity.[57] Timaeus states here that Dido is a local Libyan name meaning "wanderer" and perhaps his original account included a description of Dido's various travels before she arrived at Carthage.[58] Another ancient explanation of the name Dido is "virago", for her suicidal leap into the pyre to avoid marrying is considered a masculine deed: *virile aliquid fecit* (Servius on *Aen.* 4. 36).[59] One further ancient etymology given for her name is ἀνδροφόνος "man (or husband) killer" (Eustathius *GGM* ii, 251). This wide variety of etymologies points to the many facets of Dido's character and story and the Carthaginian queen is, as we have seen, celebrated in different contexts for very different achievements and qualities.

A complex character

We encounter the complexities and contradictions of Dido's character throughout her tale: she is a woman, a Phoenician, and a courageous leader and all these factors are significant. When she leads a group of Phoenicians away from their native land, travels widely, recruits others to join the group, and founds a new and prosperous colony, we recognize the presence of the virago, the independent queen. Yet Dido seems a woman (and at the same time a Phoenician) in the way she deals with most difficulties, avoiding confrontation and using deception to achieve her aims. The Carthaginian queen's dramatic suicide is the outstanding feature of her tale and again points to her complicated, tangled nature. The manner of her death, a leap into the pyre, is outstandingly brave, but this jump follows upon a course of deception. So too, the situation which leads to her suicide in Timaeus' tale—an unwanted marriage pressed upon her—is one which arises because she is a woman and her solution, suicide, seems a woman's answer, for she does not challenge Iarbas or her fellow

---

[57] See Honeyman 1947, 77–78 and cf. Huss 1985, 41 n. 15. Scheid and Svenbro 1985, 37–38 note that Elissa is sometimes aspirated to Ἑλίσσα and link the name with the queen's twisting and tricky intelligence.

[58] Compare Virgil's *femina . . . errans* (*Aen.* 4. 211) and cf. Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Δειδώ.

[59] See Virgil's description *dux femina facti* (*Aen.* 1. 364) and cf. Hexter 348, 374–375 nn. 77–81.

Carthaginians. Whether she dies wholly out of loyalty towards her dead husband, or, as has been suggested here, partly in order to avoid having her position usurped by a new spouse, she dies a woman.

Was Timaeus' Elissa, the earliest Dido in classical sources, a positive figure? Here, as elsewhere in *DM*, the objective tone of our notice and the brief, summary format in which only a few salient points are covered, does not permit us to penetrate beyond ADM to his source. We cannot determine whether Timaeus, normally so negative about the people of Carthage, displayed a more favorable attitude towards their first queen. The historian's Dido almost certainly had a sly and avaricious side to her character, but he may have placed a great deal of emphasis on her leadership, fortitude, and fidelity.

ATOSSA

Sources: Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F178a = *DM* 7; cf. *FGrH* 4 F178b–c. *Related Sources*: Justin 1. 2. 1 ff.; Castor *FGrH* 250 F1d; Claudian *In Eutropium* 1. 339–42; Conon *FGrH* 26 F9.

Atossa, Semiramis, and the Babylonian Nitocris

Hellanicus' Atossa is a somewhat mysterious figure. The difficulties begin with her nationality. She is the only woman who appears in *DM* without any mention of her ethnic origin and it is not clear whether she is meant to be Persian or Assyrian. Her name[1] and that of her father are clearly Persian; indeed both Herodotus and Aeschylus write of her more famous namesake who also has a powerful father, Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus. Her trousers, too, are Persian, but the protocol Atossa initiates—the eunuchs and written correspondence—is, in origin, Assyrian.[2] Hellanicus himself may have termed Atossa Persian (cf. ἡ Περσῶν ποτε ἡγησαμένη γυνή *FGrH* 4 F178b), but he began his *Persica* with an account of the Assyrians (F177), and apparently regularly called early independent rulers of Assyria "Persian" as well.[3] In fact, Hellanicus may have confused Atossa with the most famous Assyrian queen of all, Semiramis, and regarded them as one and the same person. The two women have much in common and are often seen as identical in later sources. Thus the Hellenistic historian Castor of Rhodes lists Ἄτοσσα ἡ καὶ Σεμίραμις in his Assyrian king list and his source may well be Hellanicus himself.[4] Eusebius also explicitly identifies the two and has Atossa-Semiramis ruling with her father.[5] In yet other sources, we find Semiramis credited with the deeds attributed to Atossa here[6] and she is even said to be Ninus' *daughter*.[7] To further complicate matters, the Babylonian

---

[1] Atossa is a correction in our text by Sturz; the mss. read λύττουσα. For Atossa as an Iranian name, see Schmitt 1989. Brosius 1996, 77 n. 68 and 184–185 suggests that Atossa was one of several special "throne" names given to royal Persian females.

[2] von Fritz 1967 i. 1, 489 and i. 2, 229 n. 50.

[3] Helm 1980, 257–58.

[4] *FGrH* 250 F1d; cf. Jacoby ad 4 F178 (i a, 473).

[5] *Belochus . . . huius filia Atossa quae et Semiramis, regnat cum patre annis septem.* (*Chronica* 583).

[6] Justin 1. 2. 1 ff., Claudian *In Eutropium* 1. 339–42; cf. Photius' remarks on Conon, *FGrH* 26 F9.

[7] Macrobius *Comm. in somn. Scip.* 2. 10. 7.

Nitocris described by Herodotus is frequently confused with Semiramis as well, and all three of these *DM* women—Hellanicus' Atossa, Ctesias' Semiramis, and Herodotus' Babylonian Nitocris—may be variations on one single original figure, Semiramis.[8] But the three queens certainly do not sound identical by the time Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Ctesias write of them, and ADM quite legitimately includes all 3 women in our work.

Atossa's father, Ariaspes, is equally enigmatic and it is not easy to identify him with any historical figure. In some Assyrian king lists, Atossa-Semiramis appears as the daughter of Belochus II and is followed by Beletaras, who is said to have been a gardener.[9] One scholar suggests that this Beletaras married Atossa and inherited her kingdom, thus becoming the founder of a new dynasty.[10]

Inheritance by daughters

One difference between Semiramis and Atossa is the relative importance of their parents: it is Semiramis' mother, a Syrian goddess, who is of consequence, while here, as with the remaining women of *DM*, it is Atossa's father who counts. Atossa's mother is not mentioned at all and one wonders how she felt about her daughter's unique upbringing. We can assume that Atossa had no brothers to inherit the kingdom and that is why her father raised her as a boy. Atossa is, in a sense, her father's creation, reminiscent of Athena, born of Zeus.

There are always considerable tensions when powerful fathers have no male heirs and Herodotus presents us with several instances of fathers dealing with the situation.[11] The Mede tyrant Astyages marries off his daughter Mandane to a lowly Persian and tries to kill her child, his grandson Cyrus, and Cyrus, of course, eventually deposes him (Hdt. 1. 95 ff.). The Spartan Gorgo is another only daughter (5. 48, 51) and we find her educating her father Cleomenes, warning him not to take a bribe (5. 51), rather than being educated by him in manly ways. Polybus of Sicyon who is ἄπαις (i.e. has no male children) bequeaths his kingdom to his daughter's son Adrastus

---

[8] See Momigliano 1969, 184–186; Kuhrt 1987, 543 and above, p. 66 and 107.

[9] Jacoby ad *FGrH* 4 F178; cf. Ctesias *FGrH* 688 Flo β and see Drews 1965 on Assyrian chronology in Greek writers.

[10] von Gutschmid 1890, 104.

[11] Cf. Dewald 1981, 115 n. 8.

(5. 67. 4). This last case reminds us of the Athenian heiress or *epikleros* who must marry her father's next-of-kin and whose son is considered—for all intents and purposes—not the grandson, but the biological son of his maternal grandfather.[12] In several different societies in the ancient Near East, daughters inherited when there were no sons and these daughters were often encouraged to marry men who were close relations, thus ensuring that the patrimony would remain in the family.[13] At times, Near Eastern daughters were officially adopted or appointed as "sons", even acting as the family priest, and this again meant that their children could inherit. While this flexibility in the rules may have allowed various women to attain a certain measure of independence, the intention was, it seems, to perpetuate the patrilineal system, even in cases when there were no sons.[14]

The hidden woman

Ariaspes introduces yet another option here, not only bequeathing his kingdom to his daughter, but virtually transforming her into a son by raising her as a male. As ruler, we are told, Atossa hides her true nature. While she is said to conceal her female *intelligence* or *mentality* (ἐπίνοιαν), all the means she uses—different clothing, a protective wall of eunuchs and written correspondence—hide her physical presence as a female and do not bear on her mental state. Indeed, in view of the "masculine" education that she has received from her father we would expect that it is her female body, rather than her woman's mind, that must be concealed. Did Atossa hide the fact that she was a woman throughout her reign? This would mean that she could not marry or serve as a "channel" to produce heirs to her father's throne. She is the only woman in *DM* who finds it necessary to conceal her female identity and this is the only indication in our work that women rulers might not be accepted by their subjects.

In Ctesias (*FGrH* 688 F15. 54) we find an analogous tale of an outsider who carefully disguises his (irregular) sexual identity when he wishes to rule. When the eunuch Artoxares tries to usurp the

[12] Vernant 1983, 143–146.

[13] See Ben-Barak 1980; she adduces evidences from Sumer, Nuzi, Ugarit, and ancient Israel.

[14] See Grosz 1987.

throne, he acquires a false beard and mustache, and even takes a wife, in his attempt to assimilate towards normalcy. Justin's Semiramis, who greatly resembles Atossa, also hides the fact that she is female. She is not groomed by her father to rule, but takes over after the death of her husband Ninus by pretending to be their son Ninyas. Semiramis, in Justin's account, discloses her true identity once she has performed great deeds and this only leads to greater admiration for her, *quod mulier non feminas modo virtute, sed etiam viros anteiret* (1. 2. 6). We do not know whether Atossa, who is said to have been brave and warlike in all her deeds, followed suit and revealed that she was a woman after proving her courage on the battlefield. Atossa seems both daring and hesitant: while brave and Amazon-like on the battlefield, she remains hidden and protected at court.

Hellanicus

It would be interesting to know how (or whether) Hellanicus resolved these ambiguities in his original account of Atossa. Our notice is taken from Hellanicus' *Persica*, which *may* have been earlier than Herodotus' *History*.[15] Hellanicus composed several ethnographic works on the Egyptians, Lydians, Scythians etc. and wrote of barbarian customs as well and he was, it seems, interested in women. He wrote of the Amazons in his *Atthis*[16] and his *Thessalica* may have included a description of another women found in *DM*, Thargelia (below, p. 181). A great deal of our notice is devoted to Atossa's inventions and innovations and Hellanicus was apparently quite curious about the origins of arts and customs, telling of the date of inventions, as well as the inventors themselves.[17] He assigned the discovery of fire and armor to Lemnos, attributed wine making to the Egyptians, and the invention of iron armor to Saneunus the Scythian.[18] Hellanicus' son, Scamon of Mytilene, wrote a work in several volumes called *On Inventions* and Scamon discusses the invention of writing, just as his father discusses the introduction of written correspondence here.[19]

---

[15] Scholars debate the question endlessly—see e.g. Drews 1973, 22–24.
[16] *FGrH* 4 F166–167; see above, introduction p. 17.
[17] Kleingünther 1967, 125–131.
[18] *FGrH* 4 F71b–c; F175; F189.
[19] Suda s.v. Ἑλλάνικος; *FGrH* 476 F3.

Turbans and trousers

Let us look more carefully at Atossa's innovations, beginning with headgear. The τιάρα, also known as the κυρβασία, was a Persian head-dress, a turban of sorts. The Greeks believed that Persians of different rank wore the hat at different angles, with only the king permitted to wear it upright, but this is not borne out by the physical evidence of monuments and seals.[20] Does our text mean that Atossa was the first to invent turbans or that she was the first to insist that the royal ruler wear a unique kind of headgear? In the first instance, the hat presumably was meant to disguise her female identity in some way, perhaps hiding her features or her hair. In the second case, the unique head covering would add to her aura of remoteness and power.

The next item of clothing introduced by the queen, trousers, certainly seems Persian. The very word ἀναξυρίδες may be Persian and the main feature of Persian dress was, according to Greek authors, trousers, adopted from the Medes.[21] Persians actually had two different styles of dress: wider, more flowing garments which were taken from the Elamites and worn for ceremonial purposes, and the more closely-fitting Median (or Western Iranian) trousers used for horseback riding.[22]

Trousers seem to be an ambiguous item of clothing. In Herodotus (1. 71), the Persians' leather trousers are an indication of their rugged way of life, a sign that they, a rough—and masculine—people are not worth conquering. Later, though, Aristagoras points to the fact that the Persians go to war in turbans and trousers as a sign that they will be easy to defeat in battle (5. 49. 3–4; cf. 7. 61). In the Hippocratic tract *Airs Waters Places* (22), the effeminate Scythians, the Anarieis, are especially noted for wearing trousers. They are said to be most similar to eunuchs and supposedly dress in women's clothing.[23] We also hear of items of clothing which were intended for both sexes. Ctesias' Semiramis, as we have seen, designs a special garment which makes it impossible to tell whether the wearer is male or female. This clothing is so convenient, Ctesias adds, that the

[20] Xen. *Anab.* 2. 5. 23. See Cook 1983, 250 n. 14; Sommerstein 1987, 228 and cf. Calmeyer 1987, 13–14.

[21] Hdt. 1. 71, 1. 135, 7. 61; Xen. *Anab.* 1. 5. 8; Strabo 11. 13. 9 etc.

[22] See e.g. Calmeyer 1987, esp. 11–12.

[23] See on Zarinaea, p. 91.

Medes later adapt it when they rule Asia, and after them, the Persians.[24] The robe of many colors which Amestris gives to Xerxes, who then passes it along to his mistress Artaynte (Hdt. 9. 109), must be another such item of bi-sexual clothing. Normally Persian women are depicted on seals, reliefs etc. not in trousers, but in long, many-folded dresses.[25]

Atossa does not simply wear men's clothes, but institutes a new kind of dress which is to be worn by male and female alike, thus blurring gender differences. In Justin, Semiramis also introduces tiaras and a new style of clothing which covers the arms and legs, and she does so in order to disguise her identity. She then orders everyone to dress that way so that they will not suspect that she is hiding something. Presumably, Atossa's trousers are similarly unisex and meant to circumvent gender differences. Clothing was thought to have a powerful effect on behavior—cf. e.g. Croesus' advice to Cyrus in Herodotus that the way to emasculate the Lydians is to dress them in long tunics and high boots (Hdt. 1. 155.)—and wearing the clothing of the opposite sex was particularly potent.[26] There are many examples of men who are either compelled to dress in women's clothing (e.g. Heracles as Omphale's slave, Achilles at Scyrus) or choose to do so (Pentheus, Ctesias' Sardanapallus),[27] but we also find women who disguise themselves as men. Aristophanes' Praxagora dresses in her husband's clothes in order to address the Assembly and several women philosophers, e.g. Hipparchia and Plato's pupil Axiothea, supposedly dressed in men's clothing. The Stoic Zeno is said to have been in favor of one style of dress for both sexes and this is, apparently, what Atossa institutes here.[28]

Eunuchs

The use of eunuchs, Atossa's next innovation, is clearly Assyrian in origin: eunuchs played an important role at royal courts in Assyria, both in the harem and as audience-masters of the king.[29] Hellanicus

---

[24] *FGrH* 688 F1b 6. 6; cf. Strabo 11. 13. 9.

[25] See Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993, 22–23; Brosius 1996, 85–87. Not many representations of Persian women are extant.

[26] See e.g. Ament 1993.

[27] Compare also Ctesias' Nanarus and Parsondes (above, p. 91), a particularly interesting pair.

[28] Cf. Diog. Laert. 3. 46; 7. 34.

[29] Guyot 1980, 79–80; Weidner 1954–1956 is the classic discussion.

may have discussed eunuchs at greater length in his *Persica*: according to Donatus, Hellanicus reports that the Persians learned the practice of castration from the Babylonians (*FGrH* 4 F178c), but this may be just another way of saying that Atossa instituted the use of eunuchs. The list of tribute paid to Darius each year included 500 eunuchs supplied by the Babylonians (Hdt. 3. 92. 1) and Persian rulers, too, certainly used eunuchs at court in various capacities.

Guyot notes that in late traditions it is Semiramis who is credited with the introduction of court eunuchs.[30] According to Claudian (*In Eutropium* 1. 339–42), she did so in order to be surrounded by high-voiced, beardless men who would make her own sexual identity less conspicuous. If this is also Atossa's motive in making use of eunuchs, she is again, as with the unisex clothing she introduces, trying to obfuscate the distinction between male and female. We find such overlapping or blurring of gender differences associated with rulers in ancient Egypt, where female monarchs were presented at times in masculine guise, and this is thought to be due to a perception of the Egyptian kingship as androgynous, combining both male and female elements.[31]

We have seen that powerful (barbarian) women were often linked in Greek minds with effeminate men, as if the very existence of influential women implied that the men surrounding them must be weak,[32] but Atossa and her eunuchs are not another instance of this phenomenon. These eunuchs do not highlight the decadence of a "luxurious and transgressive" woman.[33] Atossa—the female ruler who was brought up to be her father's son—has more than just physical qualities in common with the eunuchs. The queen and her eunuchs are marginal figures, unable to participate in normal human relationships. If the eunuchs are not wholly male, she is not fully female: indeed, it is likely that she neither took lovers nor bore children because of her desire to keep her sex a secret. Eunuchs, who had no relatives of their own, were thought to be particularly dependent—and consequently loyal—servants and perhaps that is why the queen found them good candidates to keep her secret. As marginal,

---

[30] Guyot 1980, 77–78 with n. 60.
[31] See Troy 1986, esp. 141–150.
[32] Above, p. 91 and p. 120.
[33] *Pace* Hall 1989, 209.

androgynous persons, eunuchs were especially well-suited to mediate between the queen and her subjects.[34]

It is nonetheless curious that it is a woman ruler who supposedly introduces eunuchs: normally eunuchs were keepers of the king's harem and in the conspiratory courts of Ctesias' *Persica*, for instance, it is not always clear who was actually in charge of the harem, the royal women or the eunuchs. Ctesias also portrays effeminate men such as Ninyas and Sardanapallus as being surrounded by their wives, mistresses, and eunuchs.[35] Such withdrawal behind a wall of eunuchs serves a dual function: it conceals the ruler's weakness, and lends him (or her!) an aura of mystery and power, clearly demarcating the ruler from his subjects.

Writing

Atossa's final innovation is the introduction of letters or writing as a means of communication with her subjects (cf. καὶ διὰ βίβλων τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ποιεῖσθαι). Some later ancient writers understood Hellanicus to mean that Atossa *invented* the epistolary form and was the first to write letters[36] and even modern authorities speculate about a collection of letters attributed to the queen.[37] Other scholars think that Atossa is credited with the invention of Old Persian writing here.[38] But it seems clear that Atossa's use of letters is related to court protocol: just as she uses eunuchs to limit access to her person, she responds to her subjects' petitions in writing, rather than orally. The writing distances her, sets her apart, and lends her words extra weight and majesty. In Justin's variation on our tale, Semiramis orders everyone to dress the same way, but it is her son, the effeminate Ninyas, who wants to be secluded and initiates the use of written messages and intermediaries.

Atossa's letters are also interesting for the indirect evidence they provide for writing by women. Female scribes—used by royal women—were a feature of Mesopotamian culture from the 3rd to the 1st millennium BC.[39] The Persepolis Fortification texts include

[34] Cf. Patterson 1982, 314–331 on court eunuchs as mediators; he revises and expands the analysis of Hopkins 1978, 172–196.
[35] *FGrH* 688 F1b 21. 1–2, F1n; F1b 23. 1–3, 24. 4, F1p.
[36] *FGrH* 4 F178b; cf. Sykutris 1931, 192.
[37] Hirzel 1895, 302 n. 2; cf. van den Hout 1949, 23–24.
[38] Cf. Briant 1992 who rejects this claim.
[39] See Meier 1991.

letters written by Persian royal women, letters which contain instructions for the administration of their estates,[40] so that Atossa was not the only female to issue orders in writing.

Remote rulers

The distant Atossa has a great deal in common with Herodotus' Deioces the Mede.[41] Deioces, once he has been chosen to be king by his fellow Medes, decrees that no one may be admitted to the royal presence: he conducts his affairs through messengers, forbids laughing and spitting in his presence, and renders his judgments in writing. Deioces also asks for bodyguards when he becomes king. All these external signs and trappings of royal etiquette are intended to add ceremony, pomp, and distance to the sovereign. Deioces has to keep his fellow Medes away because he is very familiar and too much like them; Atossa needs to be remote from her subjects because she, as a woman, is too different. Thucydides' Pausanias is another figure who changes his dress, surrounds himself with guards, and uses writing, once he has decided to adopt Persian ways and distance himself from his fellow Spartans.[42] Yet another ruler who keeps his subjects at a distance is Herodotus' false Smerdis, the magus pretender to the Persian throne. As king, he does not leave the acropolis or allow Persian nobles into his presence and he has eunuchs screen his visitors. This remote, royal behavior does not arouse any suspicion for a long time and allows him to conceal his true identity. Like Atossa, part of his telltale physiognomy needs to be hidden, and in the end, his missing ears lead to his downfall.[43]

Ambivalent Atossa

Atossa is the only women in *DM* who is presented as a *daughter* of a powerful man; all the others are the wives, mothers, and sisters of rulers. She is also the only figure who finds it necessary to conceal

---

[40] See Briant 1992 and Brosius 1996, 125 ff.

[41] Hdt. 1. 99–100; see Marquart 1891–3, 573–577 and cf. Flory 1987, 122–127.

[42] Thuc. 1. 130; cf. Hall 1989, 204; Steiner 1994, 135–136. Wallace-Hadrill 1982, esp. 33–36 is an illuminating discussion of the techniques used by Roman emperors to distance themselves from their subjects.

[43] Hdt. 3. 61 ff., esp. 3. 63. 2; 3. 68. 2, 5; 3. 69; 3. 77. 2. Compare Darius' version of the Gaumata affair—DB I §§ 10–14. 26–71.

her female identity and the two facts may be related: perhaps daughters were more difficult to accept as rulers than widows or queen mothers. Atossa's gender is ambivalent and her personality elusive. Raised as a boy, she is neither male nor female. She is brave on the battlefield, but hides away at home. The queen disguises her sexual identity in two ways: she blurs the distinction between male and female, by instituting uniform clothing for men and women alike, and she keeps her distance from her subjects by corresponding with them. Her additional innovation, the use of eunuchs, serves both functions, for the eunuchs resemble her physically, but also act as intermediaries between Atossa and her subjects. Atossa's introduction of royal protocol is particularly interesting for what it demonstrates about the value of concealment and distance. Remoteness in a despot arouses awe and admiration, and by keeping far enough away from his subjects, a ruler can hide a multitude of sins, even the fact that he is a woman.

Rhodogyne

Sources: Aeschines Socraticus fr. 18 Dittmar = *DM* 8; Philostratus *Imagines* 2. 5.
Related Sources: Polyaenus 8. 27; Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 64. 2; cf. Polyaenus 8. 26; Valerius Maximus 9. 3 ext. 4; Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 45.

Aeschines and Philostratus

Rhodogyne is a genuine warrior queen, noted above all for her prowess on the battlefield. She is presented here as a warlike, rather frightening figure who enlarges the Persian empire. If other warrior queens of *DM* engage in additional activities—Semiramis builds, Tomyris and Artemisia offer wise advice, Zarinaea civilizes her subjects—Rhodogyne's virtues are the exclusively masculine ones of courage and belligerency. We do not know if this one-dimensional portrait of Rhodogyne is due to ADM or to the original account in his source, Aeschines. Our notice does not mention the name of the dialogue in which Rhodogyne was featured, but it seems clear that she, like Thargelia, was described in Aeschines' *Aspasia*.[1] The tales of both women are told by the Socratic in order to demonstrate that exceptional women can govern successfully.

The Persian warrior queen appears in one other source, Philostratus' *Imagines* (2. 5). The author of the *Imagines* is purportedly describing a painting of Rhodogyne, where she is depicted at the battlefield, pouring a libation after her victory. Philostratus presents a vivid description of the scene, telling of dead enemies, terrified horses, captives, and a trophy. Rhodogyne's decorated mare is described in great detail, as is the queen herself—her features, costume, hairdo, weapons, expression and very thoughts. Is Philostratus telling his readers of an actual painting? Scholars have debated the question of the existence of the *Imagines* paintings for well over the century and it is impossible to determine whether a real picture underlies Philostratus' depiction of Rhodogyne.[2] In any event, in his *ecphrasis* Philostratus clearly includes additional material—such as Rhodogyne's rush to the scene of the

---

[1] See Dittmar 1912, 41–45; Ehlers 1966, 45 and below on Thargelia, p. 179.

[2] Anderson 1986, 260 and 277–278 n. 4 has a survey of bibliography on the "painting vs. literature" question. He repeatedly points out (259–268) the futility of trying to decide the issue.

battle or her prayer to conquer men—which cannot have been found in any painting and this material must stem from a literary source or from Philostratus' own imagination.[3] The author of the *Imagines* may be identical with the Philostratus who was a member of Julia Domna's circle and wrote the *Lives of the Sophists* and the *Life of Apollonius*.[4] This latter Philostratus was acquainted with Aeschines' *Aspasia* firsthand, for he quotes from the Socratic's work in a letter to the empress.[5] Since our Philostratus describes Rhodogyne's great hurry and half-plaited hair, we can assume that, whatever his identity, he too was familiar with Aeschines' tale in the *Aspasia*. Philostratus' portrait of Rhodogyne adds considerably to our knowledge of the queen and if all the details of his account come from Aeschines, this would mean that ADM was acquainted with them as well (assuming that our anonymous author consulted Aeschines firsthand—cf. below, n. 8).

Rhodogyne's hair

Rhodogyne's hair is a crucial element in her tale. She is braiding her tresses when interrupted with the news of a military rebellion: warrior queen though she may be, Rhodogyne nonetheless engages in the very womanly occupation of grooming herself. The variations on her tale, according to which the queen is in the bath or washing her hair make it plain that Rhodogyne is in the midst of her toilette, and her situation is quite different, for instance, from the Spartan soldiers who comb their hair in preparation for battle.[6] Rhodogyne's elaborately decorated mare whom, according to Philostratus (2. 5. 2), she takes to war bedecked with precious stones, represents the same combination of female decorativeness and warlike prowess as her mistress, but we must remember that Persian *men* were not averse to jewelry either.[7]

When hearing of the revolt by her subjects, the Armenians,[8] Rhodogyne vows not to finish braiding her hair until she succeeds in

---

[3] See Dittmar 1912, 41–43.

[4] See e.g. Bowersock 1969, 2–4 for a discussion of the "notorious snare" of the Philostrati.

[5] Philostratus, *epist.* 73 = Aeschines fr. 22 Dittmar.

[6] See Hdt. 7. 208. 3, 209. 3; Xen. *Lac. Pol.* 11. 3. Plutarch (*Thes.* 5) tells of warriors who have short hair to prevent hair-pulling.

[7] Xen. *Anab.* 1. 5. 8 is the classic depiction of decorative—but able—Persian males.

[8] It is Philostratus who tells us that Rhodogyne fights the Armenians. ADM first

subduing the rebels. In Herodotus (1. 82. 7–8) we find a similar tale involving victory in battle and a vow concerning hair: when the Argives lose in their battle with the Spartans over a disputed territory they institute a law that men cannot grow their hair (and women cannot wear gold) until the land is recovered. The Spartans, on the other hand, begin to wear their hair long as a result of the same conflict. The hair of these warring Greeks gives expression to their psychological state: shorn hair is a sign of grief, while long hair seems to be a sign of pride.[9] In similar fashion Rhodogyne's semi-arranged tresses are more than a colorful conceit akin to Berenice's celebrated lock. The two halves of the queen's head—one neatly braided and arranged and the other left unkempt and flying loose—symbolize or point to the two sides of her personality, the cool rational commander and the wild fighting woman. Philostratus, who says that the two halves of Rhodogyne's hair are two different colors in the painting, appreciates this duality: he states that the bound hair points to Rhodogyne's modesty and restraint while the loose side hints at her Bacchic frenzy and vigor (2. 5. 2). Philostratus uses the same technique of blending descriptions of physical details with moral or psychological interpretations elsewhere in the *Imagines*,[10] and we do not know if Aeschines also noted the symbolism behind the two halves of the queen's head. Perhaps the description of Rhodogyne as "brave . . . and frightening" (ἀνδρείαν . . . καὶ φοβεράν) in our notice hints at such a distinction.

A man-hater

Rhodogyne's flying semi-arranged hair characterizes her as a liminal figure on the borderline between civilization and Amazon-like "otherness". Philostratus is careful to note that Rhodogyne is *not* an Amazon in her dress, but he assigns her quality often associated with

speaks rather vaguely of certain rebellious tribes τινὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν and then later in the notice refers to the προειρημένα "aforementioned" tribes, without, in fact, having mentioned them at all! This is either a slip of the pen or a sign that our author has not consulted Aeschines directly here and has copied the phrase indiscriminately from an intermediary source. (Compare the straightforward use of the word in the phrase τὴν προειρημένην πόλιν in the Dido notice.)

[9] See How & Wells 1912 i, 97 (ad Hdt. 1. 82. 7).

[10] See Beall 1993, esp. 354 with n. 21. Compare too Philostratus' description of Rhodogyne's expressive eyes whose color varies from gray to black and serve to indicate her joy at victory, her natural beauty, and her regal haughtiness (2. 5. 5).

Amazons, the hatred of men.[11] In Philostratus' painting, the Persian queen is pouring a libation and he adds that she is praying to destroy (αἱρεῖν) men, just as she has already destroyed some males, for it seems that she does not love to be loved (οὐ γάρ μοι δοκεῖ ἐρᾶν τοῦ ἐρᾶσθαι 2. 5. 4).[12] Did Aeschines, ADM's source, also tell of the queen's alleged aversion to men? If Aeschines did in fact portray Rhodogyne as a man-hater, this would mean that our anonymous author toned down the "Amazon" queen, celebrating her courage, but omitting what is perhaps her most frightening aspect, her antipathy towards men. None of the warrior women in *DM* are noted for their animosity to men and this may be the result of skillful editing by ADM.

Rhodogyne and Semiramis

Rhodogyne, then, is not a Tomyris-figure, a courageous queen who defends her family and country. She does battle in order to preserve her empire, and when subduing rebellious tribes she apparently delights in the actual battle with—and victory over—men. Of all the women in *DM*, the Persian queen is perhaps most similar to Semiramis, another aggressive conqueror of an empire, who also displays an ambivalent attitude towards men, killing off her lovers once she has tired of them. It may not be a coincidence that the two most warlike women in *DM* are also those with the most anomalous sex life: the lustful, widowed Semiramis and virginal, man-hating Rhodogyne are perhaps two sides of the same coin, anomalous, disturbing women who are outside the "normal" category of fecund women.[13] The two women are, in fact, sometimes linked or confused in ancient sources.[14] Dio Chrysostom, when mentioning famous women of old, speaks of warlike Rhodogyne and regal Semiramis (Ῥοδογούνη πολεμικὴ καὶ Σεμίραμις βασιλικὴ 64. 2) in the same sentence. Valerius Maximus (9. 3 ext. 4) assigns the whole of Rhodogyne's tale here to Semiramis: his Assyrian queen is combing her hair when she hears that Babylon has fallen. She then vows to leave her tresses unbraided

[11] See e.g. Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F167c; Aes. *PV* 723–4 Ἀμαζόνων στρατὸν... στυγάνορα. Cf. Hardwick 1990 and above introduction, p. 17.

[12] Philostratus nonetheless lingers over the queen's beauty and describes her mouth as sweetest to kiss (*Imag.* 2. 5. 5).

[13] See Ardener 1978, esp. 40–43 and above on Semiramis, p. 82.

[14] See Ehlers 1966, 48–50.

until she recaptures the city, is successful in her quest, and subsequently has a statue erected in her honor. In his *Strategemata*, Polyaenus writes of Semiramis and Rhodogyne in two successive notices (8. 26–27) and he conflates their tales. He opens his account of Semiramis with a story of her bathing when she hears of a rebellion; the queen, we are told, immediately sets off to war unshod and with her hair unbraided. The rest of Polyaenus' account is not a description of this battle, but a long quotation from a stele which Semiramis has allegedly erected, telling of her great deeds (above, p. 79). In the very next chapter of his work, Polyaenus tells of Rhodogyne who is in the midst of washing her hair when a messenger announces that a subject tribe has rebelled. She does not rinse her hair but binds it and then leaps on her horse and leads an army into battle, swearing not to wash her hair unless she subdues the rebels. After a protracted struggle, Rhodogyne is victorious and she then rinses her hair. The Persian king, concludes Polyaenus, has a royal seal with a picture of Rhodogyne and her bound (presumably soapy) hair. Polyaenus' account is very close to our notice, but there are no verbal similarities between the *Strategemata* and *DM*. The slight differences between the two tales (wet, rather than unbraided hair, a seal instead of a statue) may simply be an instance of the variations often found in oral traditions. But the fact that Polyaenus includes a nearly identical situation—a woman ruler is interrupted with the news of a rebellious tribe while grooming herself—in two consecutive notices well demonstrates just how careless his compilation can be.[15] If elsewhere in *DM* women such as Nitocris the Babylonian and Atossa seem to be variations on the original figure of Semiramis, here it is likely that the story of the disarranged hair was first told of Rhodogyne and only later assigned to the better known Semiramis.[16]

Representations of Rhodogyne

Some form of plastic representation is associated with Rhodogyne in all these tales: in *DM* we hear of a golden statue of the queen, in Polyaenus of a royal seal (or signet ring, σφραγίς) with her image, and Philostratus describes a painting of her.[17] And indeed the single

[15] See on Artemisia (p. 216) and Tomyris (p. 197).
[16] Cf. Dittmar 1912, 43 n. 140; Ehlers 1966, 48 n. 51.
[17] For the evidence that royal Persian women were indeed depicted in art, see Brosius 1996, 84–87.

image of the queen riding on a horse with half her hair flying loose conveys the essence of Rhodogyne's character and tale. Philostratus (2. 5. 1) states that Rhodogyne is celebrated in song wherever there are Greeks; there may have been frequent portraits of the queen as well.

Zarinaea is another woman in *DM* who has a golden statue erected in her honor, but ADM does not mention the Median queen's monument, which seems a less integral part of her story. More interesting for our purposes is the relief of the 5th century BC Argive poetess, Telesilla, which Pausanias (2. 20. 8) describes. Telesilla is supposed to have been a courageous warrior as well as a writer, organizing the women of Argos in their successful battle against Cleomenes, king of Sparta. In the relief, Telesilla's books have been thrown down at her feet and she is looking at a helmet she holds in her hand and is about to put on her head.[18] Thus both Rhodogyne and Telesilla are portrayed as being summoned to battle while in the midst of other, quieter occupations. Telesilla's books and helmet serve the same function as the two halves of the Persian queen's hair and represent in a strikingly graphic way the two faces of a woman—in this instance, poet and warrior.

Who was Rhodogyne?

It is difficult to identify our Rhodogyne, who is presented without any family connections, with any historical Persian woman. There is no other evidence for an independent female ruler in Persia, although actual royal Persian women had a considerable measure of economic independence and played an active, public role at court.[19] In Greek writers such as Herodotus and Ctesias,[20] Persian queens are often portrayed as powerful figures, but they are normally shown operating behind the scenes, not sitting on a throne.[21] In these historians'

[18] For Telesilla, see Plutarch *Mulierum Virtutes* 4 = *Mor.* 245c–f; Stadter 1965, 45–53; Snyder 1989, 59–63. See too Vidal-Naquet 1981, esp. 191–193 who discusses the links between traditions of powerful women and of powerful slaves.

[19] See Brosius 1996, a thorough study of royal (and non-royal) Persian women from 559 to 331 BC which utilizes both Greek literary sources and Near Eastern evidence, particularly the fortification texts from Persepolis.

[20] It is likely that Ctesias influenced Aeschines, ADM's source here—see Dittmar 1912, 44; Ehlers 1966, 50.

[21] Gera 1993, 200–203, 216–217 and Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993 are brief surveys of powerful Persian queens in Greek historiography; see too Brosius 1996 *passim.*

tales, Persian kings sometimes fight Amazon-like Scythian queens,[22] but Rhodogyne presents a rare *Persian* instance of a bold warrior woman who controls an empire. Atossa of *DM* is, perhaps, a second such figure and Ctesias' Zarinaea, who is Median, is another close counterpart. In fifth century Athenian art, Amazons were often represented in Persian dress, perhaps in order to establish a link between defeated Oriental barbarians and women.[23] Such representations may have led to tales of an Amazon-like Persian queen.

In Greek sources, the very Greek sounding name Rhodogyne recurs several time in the Persian royal family.[24] The earliest Rhodogyne, chronologically, is the wife of Hystaspas and mother of Darius. Darius' son, Xerxes names one of his daughters Rhodogyne, and his son Artaxerxes gives the name Rhodogyne to one of his daughters as well.[25] None of these three women was, apparently, our Rhodogyne: in extant sources they are mentioned briefly as wives, mothers, or daughters of rulers, with no hint of any independent, warlike activities.[26] Jerome (*Against Jovinian* 1. 45) tells of a more assertive Rhodogyne: she is identified as the daughter of Darius and puts her nurse to death for suggesting that she remarry. Jerome's Rhodogyne is held up as an example of a loyal wife—turned chaste widow—who is unwilling to marry a second time. Is she identical with our Rhodogyne, who, as we have seen, is said to dislike men altogether? We can reconcile Jerome's account with *DM* if we assume that our Rhodogyne is, in fact, a widow and her reluctance to wed again may stem from a Semiramis-like desire to preserve her throne, despite Jerome's emphasis on her chastity. But ADM, who is usually careful to include the names of male relatives in his notices, has no mention of Darius as Rhodogyne's father and no hint of a husband, so that it seems likely that Jerome is referring to another Rhodogyne.[27]

---

[22] See on Zarinaea (p. 95) and Tomyris (p. 199).

[23] See Fantham *et al.* 1994, 131 vs. Hardwick 1990, 29. Tyrrell 1984, 63 notes that soft Persian men evoked in the imagination hard Amazon women; Rhodogyne is an instance of a hard *Persian* woman.

[24] Normally the name is spelled 'Ροδογούνη; only *DM* has the form 'Ροδογύνη.

[25] Brosius 1996, 184–185 suggests that the frequent use of the name Rhodogyne for royal females may indicate that it was an official name, rather than a personal one; see on Atossa, p. 141.

[26] Suda s.v. 'Ροδογούνη; *FGrH* 688 F 13. 24, 14. 34; Plut. *Artax.* 27. 4. There is a later Rhodogyne, a Parthian princess, daughter of Mithridates I and wife of Demetrius Nicator—see Appian *Syr.* 67–68. Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 21. 7) also mentions a Rhodogyne, who could be any one of these women. Justi 1895, 261 has a fuller list of Persian Rhodogynes; he thinks that Dio refers to the Rhodogyne of *DM.*

[27] Cf. Bickel 1915, 321; Justi 1895, 261.

The information available on Rhodogyne is fairly limited. We know nothing of the date, family, or historicity of the Persian queen. Indeed, the whole of Rhodogyne's tale in *DM* (and possibly in Aeschines and Aeschines' source as well) centers around one incident: the queen charges off to quash a rebellion even though she is in the midst of combing her hair. Rhodogyne is presented solely as a warrior and we do not hear of her personal relations, her rule at home, her intelligence or accomplishments. Paradoxically, the Persian queen is also shown to us at one of her most feminine moments, in her boudoir so to speak, so that our overall impression is of a *woman* warrior. (It is difficult to come up with a parallel tale of a male ruler who has to deal with a sudden rebellion in the midst of grooming himself. Cincinnatus, for example, is called away from his plow.) Rhodogyne is unabashedly female and it is worth contrasting her attitude with that of Atossa, another warrior queen. Atossa is brave and confident on the battlefield, but at home she is apparently ashamed of her gender and tries to conceal the fact that she is a woman. Rhodogyne has no such qualms, as her unbraided hair and subsequent statue make clear. In her independence, fortitude on the battlefield, and lack of male relations to place her, Rhodogyne is the most Amazon-like woman found in *DM*.

Lyde

Source: Xenophilus *FGrH* 767 F1 (= *DM* 9); cf. Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F63, F64.
Related Sources: Herodotus 1. 16–22, 25; Suda s.v. Ἀλυάττης.

Xenophilus, Nicolaus, and Xanthus

Our notice is the sole surviving fragment of Xenophilus' *Lydian histories*. Xenophilus is the most obscure of the sources cited by ADM and there is no real evidence for his life or writings, but it is generally believed that he was a Hellenistic author. One date suggested for Xenophilus is based on an emendation of the name of a source cited in a paraphrase of Callimachus; this would make Xenophilus at the latest, a contemporary of Callimachus, i.e. a writer of the third century BC or earlier.[1] Nicolaus of Damascus, writing in the first century BC, provides further background to our tale and commentators agree that Nicolaus made use—either directly or indirectly—of the 5th century BC historian, Xanthus of Lydia, when narrating Lydian affairs.[2] It is likely that Xenophilus, too, used Xanthus' *Lydiaca* and he may even have been the intermediary source whom Nicolaus is thought to have consulted.[3] We do not know how closely Xenophilus followed Xanthus' original work, which survives only in fragments. Xanthus included a great many colorful, romantic, and sensational stories in his work—telling e.g. of a gluttonous king who ate his wife and Amazons who blinded their male children—[4] so that a longer and perhaps livelier account of Lyde and her troublesome son in Xanthus' *Lydiaca* may be the ultimate source for the information in our notice.

The historical background

The heroine of our tale, Lyde, is Croesus' grandmother (and the granddaughter of Gyges) and her story should be thought of as taking

[1] Cf. Antigonus *Histor. Mirab.* 151 = Callimachus fr. 407, where Ζηνόφιλον is emended to Ξενόφιλον and see Regenbogen 1943, 23–24; Herter 1967, 1566–1567.
[2] See e.g. Drews 1973, 101–102 and 194 n. 19 and the further references there.
[3] Regenbogen 1943, 142–143; cf. von Fritz 1967, i. 2, 350 n. 8 and 372.
[4] See *FGrH* 765 F18; F22.

place towards the close of the seventh century BC.[5] Nicolaus-Xanthus (*FGrH* 90 F63) tells us that Lyde was originally married to a man named Miletus, who was related to the Basilids, the royal family of Ephesus, and was descended from Melas, a son-in-law of Gyges. Lyde's brother Sadyattes (whom Xenophilus calls Alyattes: the names are confused in the various sources)[6] snatches her away from Miletus on a pretext, Nicolaus adds, rapes her, and then keeps her as his wife. Sadyattes, who is described by Nicolaus as unbridled (ἀκόλαστος) not only persecutes Lyde's original husband, but takes two other wives, sisters, as well. He has sons by all three women, but only Alyattes, his son by Lyde, is considered legitimate and it is he who inherits his father's throne. Sadyattes-Alyattes' incestuous union with his sister is clearly scandalous behavior and we are reminded of Cambyses, another short-tempered king who marries his sister.[7] The king's marriage to his sister and mistreatment of her Basilid husband is explained by some scholars as stemming from political motives: Alyattes' intention was to limit Ephesian influence on Lydian rule.[8]

The queen mother

As often is the case with the *women* involved in stories of this kind, we hear nothing of Lyde's reaction to her brother's deed and her sudden change of spouses. The queen's story has, at first sight, two distinct halves, for she is presented in quite different ways as a wife and a mother. In Nicolaus, Lyde appears simply as Alyattes' anonymous sister and Miletus' wife: she is married to one man, abducted, raped, and then married to another, and seems to be a passive victim of circumstances. Xenophilus, on the other hand, gives Lyde a name and an identity of her own. She plays a prominent role (after her husband has died) and is a strong and loving mother, who takes pains to perpetuate her son's rule. In other words, Lyde is consider-

---

[5] See e.g. Asheri 1988, 273 who dates Alyattes' reign to 617–560 BC in Herodotus' chronology.

[6] Heeren 1789, 20 emends the Ἀλυάτεω of our text to Σαδυάττεω. Alexander 1913, 39 suggests that the forms Sadyattes, Adyattes, and Alyattes are all variations of the same name which may have been a royal Lydian title. Pedley 1972, 22–25 is a convenient collection of the various sources on Alyattes.

[7] See Alexander 1913, 40–42 who suggests that the Lydian version came first; he thinks that Xanthus' wife-eating Cambles (*FGrH* 765 F18; cf. 90 F22) is a third variation on this figure.

[8] Cf. Georges 1994, 29–32.

ably more powerful and influential as queen mother than she was as queen. One role allotted to queen mothers in various societies is that of a buffer between the king and his people. The queen mother is often a judicious figure who acts as a stabilizing and moderate influence and this is precisely the part played by Lyde in our tale.[9] She must have demonstrated considerable political ingenuity when placating the important citizens who were humiliated by her son. The Lydian queen uses persuasion, not force, to ensure that these subjects will not rebel and her son will remain on the throne. She is a gentle and diplomatic woman who makes the best of difficult family circumstances and this, in fact, is the link between the two halves of the queen's story: Lyde accommodates herself to her violent and difficult relatives and ensures that her family will continue to rule Lydia.

Omphale and Candaules' wife

There are stories of two other famous Lydian queens, Omphale and Candaules' anonymous wife, who were also violated, but their reactions to the deed are much more extreme and bring about a change in the government of their country. According to one version of her tale, Omphale is raped by Lydian nobles; she then becomes ruler and avenges herself on the men who have violated her. As ruler, Omphale will kill off her discarded lovers, just as Semiramis does.[10] The queen also purchases Heracles as a slave and in some accounts, the Heracles found at Omphale's side is an emasculated, Ninyas-type figure who wears colorful clothing, braids his hair, and works wool.[11] The other powerful Lydian queen, Candaules' wife, avenges herself on her husband when he displays her in the nude to Gyges. She arranges his death and marrys Gyges who then succeeds Candaules to the throne (Hdt. 1. 8–12). Lyde, the granddaughter of this queen, is far gentler than her two famed predecessors and devotes her energies to taming her son, rather than avenging herself on her brother-husband.

---

[9] See Andreasen 1983 on Israelite (and modern African) queen mothers; Brosius 1996, 116–119 discusses royal Persian women who act as intercessors with the king.

[10] Athen. 515f-516c = Clearchus fr. 43a Wehrli; cf. Xanthus *FGrH* 765 F4.

[11] Plut. *Mor.* 785e; Lucian, *Dialogi deorum* 15. 2; cf. above, p. 82. In another version, Omphale inherits her kingdom peaceably from her husband Tmolus; she then buys Heracles whom Hermes has sold into slavery- Apoll. *Bibl.* 2. 6. 3.

Alyattes

Lyde's son Alyattes is, like his father, short-tempered and difficult: both Nicolaus and the Suda describe him as ὑβριστής καὶ ἀκόλαστος.[12] Difficult sons are a recurring pattern in tales of these Lydian rulers, for Croesus, the son of the next generation, was also troublesome in his youth, according to Nicolaus (90 F65. 1), so that Alyattes, who becomes just and well-behaved, will need to tame a wild son just as his mother did. Alyattes' behavior here—spitting and tearing the clothes of others—sounds simply childish, but elsewhere we hear of more violent deeds on his part, for he is said to have murdered Colophonian aristocrats wholesale at a feast.[13] Lyde, the kindest mother found in *DM*, uses deception to ensure that her son will mend his ways and retain his throne, but her trickery is the most harmless kind imaginable. Self-starvation, *inedia*, was regarded as a dignified method of suicide, which gave proof of determination and perseverance. At times *inedia* was used as a cry for help or a mild form of blackmail, and this is precisely the case with Lyde.[14]

Herodotus' Alyattes undergoes experiences which are not dissimilar to those described in our notice. The Lydian king of the *History* becomes ill and recovers only after he placates a female figure, Athena, when he rebuilds the goddess' temple which he has accidentally destroyed. The Herodotean Alyattes is also deceived about the quantity of food available to his enemies, the Milesians—just as our Alyattes is fooled about his mother's food intake—and this leads to a reconciliation with them. While the king is not transformed into "the most honest and just of men" of our notice, Alyattes of the *History* does make peace with his enemies after his illness, and he also builds two temples for Athena, in addition to sending gifts to Delphi (Hdt. 1. 16–22, 25).

A kindly queen

The pacific, kindly Lyde, who does not rule on her own and operates chiefly behind the scenes, is unlike most of the other women in *DM*. She is neither warlike nor particularly accomplished in traditionally masculine domains and is outstanding only as a loving, con-

---

[12] Cf. Nicolaus *FGrH* 90 F64 and Suda s.v. Ἀλυάττης.
[13] Polyaenus 7. 2.
[14] See van Hooff 1990, 32–33, 38, 42, and 45.

ciliatory, and gently deceitful mother. It seems safe to assume that ADM—who cites Herodotus as a source in 5 of our 14 notices—was acquainted with the outstanding Lydian queen in Herodotus, Candaules' wife, a striking figure who brings about a change of dynasties and earns a place in other catalogues of notable women.[15] Yet our anonymous author found Lyde a figure more worthy of inclusion in his collection than her grandmother and consequently broadens considerably his definition of unusually intelligent and courageous women. This is, perhaps, Lyde's greatest contribution to our work, serving as an example of a different kind of extraordinary queen.

---

[15] See e.g. Jerome *Against Jovinian* 1. 45 and cf. above, intro. p. 55.

Pheretime

Source: Menecles *FGrH* 270 F5 (= *DM* 10).
Related Sources: Herodotus 4. 162–167, 200–205; Aristotle περὶ πολιτειῶν fr. 611. 16 (Rose); Polyaenus 8. 47; Suda s.vv. ἐπεφόρησε, ἐμπεδορκεῖν, εὐλαί. See too Aeneas Tacticus 37. 6; Polyaenus 7. 34.

Menecles of Barca

ADM's source for this notice is Menecles of Barca. We know very little about Menecles, and it seems that ADM does not expect his readers to recognize the name either, for he immediately describes him as the writer of a *Libyan Histories*. Athenaeus provides us both with a *terminus post quem* and a native city for Menecles, relating that Menecles of Barca reported on the banishing of Greek scholars from Alexandria by Ptolemy VII Physcon (146–118 BC).[1] Consequently, Menecles is usually dated to the middle or late second century BC,[2] but he could be later.[3]

The most immediate question raised by our notice is: why Menecles? Pheretime is a memorable figure in Herodotus' *History*, a strong-minded queen who takes cruel revenge on her son's murderers and then dies herself in horrible fashion. She is, according to Herodotus, independent, ruling in Cyrene in her son's absence, and she is also militant, for she first persuades the Persian satrap to send an army to Barca and then accompanies the forces in order to avenge her son's death. Why, then, does ADM—who uses the Halicarnassian's *History* as his source for five other women in our work—prefer the account of the relatively unknown author Menecles, when telling of Pheretime?

Jacoby thinks that Menecles did not write an actual local history of Cyrene, but that his Λιβυκαὶ ἱστορίαι was a series of self-contained stories, collected by a scholarly philologist, rather than a historian.[4] The only other surviving fragment of Menecles' *Libyan Histories* (270 F6) indicates that the Barcian was both acquainted with Herodotus' *History* and critical of the Halicarnassian. In this fragment, Menecles finds Herodotus' account of the foundation of Cyrene too fabulous

[1] Athen. 184b–c = *FGrH* 270 F9.
[2] Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 (iii a, 223); cf. ad *FGrH* 370 (iii b (comm.), 137); Müller *FHG* iv, 448; Chamoux 1953, 111; Mitchell 1966, 105 n. 33.
[3] Fraser 1972 i, 517–518; ii, 745–746 nn. 198–199.
[4] Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 (iii a, 223).

(μυθικωτέραν) and prefers another, more plausible (πιθανωτέραν) version of events. We shall see that he presents a different version of Pheretime's life as well, and his full-scale, unabbreviated tale of the queen—which may have been quite lengthy and detailed—was probably even more unique. Modern scholars tend to find Herodotus' account of Pheretime more trustworthy than that of Menecles, despite the latter's Libyan background,[5] but for our purposes the most interesting point about Menecles is his relative obscurity. Why did ADM prefer Menecles to the easily accessible Herodotus, as his source for Pheretime? How exactly did the two tales differ? And how did Menecles better suit our anonymous author's purposes? A closer look at the various sources on the queen will provide some possible solutions—but no definitive answer—to these questions.

Pheretime and the Battiads

Pheretime was wife of Battus the Third, known as Battus the Lame. Herodotus tells us that Battus' father, Arcesilaus II, was assassinated after warring with his brothers; subsequently the assassin was murdered as well. Thus Battus III came to the throne during troubled times and sweeping reforms which limited royal powers in Cyrene, were introduced during his reign (Hdt. 4. 160–161). In other words, the monarchy limped as much as the monarch or as Macan states: "χωλός looks like the translation into physics of the political situation."[6] It seems that Battus willingly relinquished much royal prerogative: the strong-minded Pheretime has a conciliatory husband.

Pheretime herself is termed Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου (Hdt. 4. 205) and since such genitives are usually used for "daughter of" rather than "wife of,"[7] How and Wells suggest that Pheretime, in addition to being the wife of Battus III, was also the daughter of Battus II; this would mean that she married her nephew. These commentators note that Herodotus tells us that Pheretime's son, Arcesilaus III married a relative (4. 164. 4) and point out that if Pheretime were a member

---

[5] Chamoux 1953, 153 n. 1; Mitchell 1966, 104–105.

[6] Macan 1895 i, 115 (ad Hdt. 4. 161). Vernant 1988 is illuminating on the relation between lameness and tyranny, but wrongly claims (p. 209) that Battus the Lame was the last of the Battiads to rule in Cyrene.

[7] Kühner-Gerth 1898, ii. 1, 334: sect. 414 have this as the sole instance of the so-called Ἕκτορος Ἀνδρομάχη construction; see Macan 1895 i, 152 and Corcella 1993, 390 (both ad Hdt. 4. 205).

of the royal family by birth, this would explain the prominent role she plays. (Elsewhere, How and Wells use the marriage of Arcesilaus III to his relation, the daughter of Alazeir, king of Barca as evidence for intermarriage between Greeks and native Libyans; such intermarriage, they add, "explains the brutal cruelty of Pheretime which is quite un-Hellenic.")[8] Plutarch (*Mor.* 261d) furnishes further evidence for marriage among the Battiads. He tells us that Pheretime's mother-in-law, Eryxo, was married to her first cousin, Arcesilaus II, for Eryxo's mother, Critola, is the sister of Battus II. Thus even if we do not take Herodotus' Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου to mean that Pheretime was the *daughter* of a Battus, is it not unlikely that the queen was herself a Battiad.[9]

Arcesilaus III

We do not hear of Pheretime until her husband dies and her son Arcesilaus III inherits the throne. Herodotus indicates that Arcesilaus was a bloodthirsty, vindictive monarch, who refused to accept the limitations imposed on his power and the granting of privileges to ordinary citizens. The young monarch demanded a full restoration of the royal rights held by his forefathers and this stance led to stasis in Cyrene. In the *History* the unpopular Arcesilaus is killed on the spur of the moment. Arcesilaus flees to Barca after he disregards (or misunderstands) an oracle and cruelly "bakes" his opponents in Cyrene. While he is in the market place of Barca, the local people, together with exiles from Cyrene spot him, and they kill Arcesilaus III along with his father-in-law, the ruler of Barca (Hdt. 4. 161–164). Subsequently, although Arcesilaus is killed spontaneously by these Barcians and exiled Cyrenians, all of the people of Barca declare themselves responsible for the death of the cruel king (4. 167. 2; 4. 200. 1) and Pheretime will revenge herself upon the entire city.

Arcesilaus III seems, then, to have been a decided contrast to his mild-mannered father, Battus the Lame.[10] In Plutarch (*Mor.* 260e) we hear of another such contrasting father and son in the Battiad royal family, for he tells us that Arcesilaus II had a harsh nature and

---

[8] How and Wells 1912 i, 369 and 346 (ad Hdt. 4. 205 and 4. 145. 1).

[9] Cf. Legrand 1945, 201 (ad Hdt. 4. 205).

[10] Cf. Hdt. 4. 164. 1–2; 4. 167. 2; 4. 162. 1–2. Arcesilaus' cruelty has been attributed to the negative influence of his virago mother, Pheretime—cf. Thrige 1940, 177–178—but she apparently had no such effect on her husband.

was not at all like his father, Battus the Happy (Βάττος Εὐδαίμων): the two assassinated kings, Arcesilaus II and his grandson Arcesilaus III may have been somewhat alike. We shall see that there are also similarities between Arcesilaus II's wife Eryxo and Arcesilaus III's mother Pheretime. In fact, there seems to be something cyclic or repetitious about Cyrenian history, with frequent doublets and parallels between the various Battiad rulers and this may be due to the oral traditions underlying these tales. Thus the paths of Pheretime and her son sometimes run in parallel fashion: in the *History* Arcesilaus twice goes into exile, just as Pheretime twice flees to a friendly king and asks for an army. The Herodotean Arcesilaus III has two sets of opponents, at home and at Barca, just as in *DM* Pheretime has enemies in Egypt and in Cyrene.

Herodotus' Arcesilaus is also reminiscent of the Corinthian tyrant Periander and these parallels extend above and beyond the qualities often attributed to tyrants in the *History*.[11] Both Periander and Arcesilaus have limping (Labda, Battus the Lame) and lowborn ancestors (Eëtion, Battus I)[12] and both the Cypselids and the Battiads are warned by oracles of the limited time allotted their dynasties. In addition, both Arcesilaus and Periander attempt to send their enemies abroad in order to be punished, only to have their plans foiled. The two tyrants are cruel and the hatred they arouse spills over onto their closest associates, leading to their deaths (Periander's son Lycophron, Arcesilaus' father-in-law Alazeir). Finally both receive an enigmatic message involving baking in an oven.[13]

Herodotus' Pheretime as ruler

Returning to Pheretime, we find that the Herodotean queen is quite active even while her son is alive. We are told that Pheretime took over for Arcesilaus in Cyrene during the time he was in Barca and she even sits on the council.[14] Despite her Greek blood, she seems an archetypal Near Eastern queen mother.[15] Heraclides, the epitomator

[11] See e.g. Chamoux 1953, 158–159 and Immerwahr 1966, 194–196 versus Waters 1985, 131–133.

[12] Cf. Immerwahr 1966, 194 n. 15.

[13] Hdt. 3. 48–53, 5. 92; 4. 162–165.

[14] Cf. ἡ δὲ εἶχε αὐτὴ τοῦ παιδὸς τὰ γέρεα ἐν Κυρήνῃ καὶ τἆλλα νεμομένη καὶ ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα Hdt. 4. 165. Corcella 1993, 356 (ad loc.) notes that there is evidence for a council in Cyrene in the 4th cent. BC.

[15] Cf. Chamoux 1953, 149.

of Aristotle's περὶ πολιτειῶν, whose report on Pheretime is very similar to that of Herodotus, actually uses the word ἐβασίλευσε to describe the queen's rule in Cyrene but this may be due to the brevity of his account.[16] When Arcesilaus III goes to Samos for help to reinstate his rule, Pheretime goes off on her own to Euelthon of Salamis and pleads his cause there (Hdt. 4. 162). (Euelthon does not, however, take kindly to her request for an army, and gives her a golden spindle and distaff instead, putting her in her place as a woman—see below, p. 212.)

Pheretime of the *History* negotiates with foreign rulers a second time, after Arcesilaus is killed. She approaches Aryandes, the Persian satrap in Egypt for an army with which to attack Barca and punish her son's assassins. Aryandes was appointed satrap of Egypt by Cambyses and continued as satrap under Darius for at least another 10 years. He then revolted against Darius and was put to death.[17] In Herodotus' version, we are given the impression that Aryandes supplied Pheretime with an army entirely on his own initiative, without consulting Darius, and this independent move has been interpreted as an early indication of his rebellious ways.[18] In any event, neither Pheretime nor the Persian satrap are particularly honest in their dealings with one another, according to the *History*.[19] The Cyrenian queen claims that Arcesilaus was murdered because of his medism and while it is true that after Cambyses conquered Egypt, Arcesilaus III recognized the Persian king's authority and paid him tribute (Hdt. 3. 13), it is clear that it was not Arcesilaus' relationship with Persia, but his unbridled behavior with his subjects, which led to his murder.[20] Aryandes pities the bereaved Pheretime, but, adds Herodotus, this sympathy is a good cover for his actions: he sends a Persian army to Barca because he is interested in the subjugation of Libya.

---

[16] The continuation of his notice καὶ πολεμοῦσα πρὸς Βαρκαίους, λαβοῦσα δὲ τὴν Βάρκην (fr. 611. 16 Rose) again makes the Cyrenian queen sound more powerful and independent than she was in Herodotus' account.

[17] Cook 1983, 40, 60, and 64; see Corcella 1993, 356 (ad Hdt. 4. 166).

[18] Cook 1983, 64 and cf. Tuplin 1989, 76–77.

[19] Hdt. 4. 165–167; cf. Benardete 1969, 124.

[20] See Mitchell 1966 for a detailed study of Battiad medism and the relations between Cyrene and Persia.

Pheretime's date

The dispatch of Persian forces to Libya is the one event in Pheretime's career which can be fixed with some degree of precision, for Herodotus carefully synchronizes the Persian expedition to Libya with Megabazus' operations in the Hellespont after Darius' Scythian campaign (4. 145. 1), so that this expedition can be "fairly securely dated to either 514 or 513 BC."[21] Herodotus tells us that two commanders, the general Amasis[22] and the admiral Badres, are sent by Aryandes to lead the Persian forces (4. 167. 1). There is an interesting division of authority between these Persian military leaders and Pheretime: the Persians conquer Barca and then give the queen a free hand in the city, allowing her to decide how the captive Barcians are to be treated.

The cruel queen

Herodotus' Cyrenian queen seems ferocious when avenging her son's death after the conquest of Barca. She impales the men who murdered her son, cuts off the breasts of their wives,[23] and arranges the victims and breasts in a circle around the walls of Barca (Hdt. 4. 202). But there is probably something ritualistic or ceremonial about this careful arrangement: we are reminded of Xerxes cutting Pythius' son in half and having his army march between the two halves (7. 39). Such mutilation was, in fact, the usual Persian punishment for rebels.[24] Other kings in Herodotus also mark and mutilate the bodies of their subjects as a means of asserting and exercising power.[25] Another queen in the *History* who torments her victims is Xerxes' wife, Amestris. She cuts off the breasts, nose, ears, lips, and tongue of Masistes' wife, the mother of her rival Artaynte (9. 112) and buries 14 Persian youngsters alive in an attempt to stave off her own death (7. 114). Amestris seems as stalwart and harsh as Herodotus' Pheretime,

---

[21] Mitchell 1966, 100–101 with n. 8; cf. Chamoux 1953, 152 with n. 1; Macan 1895 i, 118 (ad Hdt. 4. 165.1), ii, 263; Corcella 1993, 354 and 357–358.

[22] He probably should not be identified with the Arsames of Polyaenus 7. 28. 1—see Chamoux 1953, 164–165; Mitchell 1966, 108 with n. 48; Corcella 1993, 357 (ad Hdt. 4. 167).

[23] Waters 1985, 135 n. 24 points out that the cutting off of a woman's breasts corresponds to the castration of a male. Perhaps Pheretime symbolically "castrates" the women who have murdered her son, preventing them, as it were, from bearing children.

[24] See Hall 1989, 158–159; Corcella 1993, 388 (ad Hdt. 4. 202).

[25] See Hartog 1988, 332–334 and Steiner 1994, 154–155.

but she is more of an indoor figure who is active behind the scenes and that may be one reason why she is not included in *DM*. Xerxes' queen has her victim handed over to her as the result of a request at a party, not after a bitter military campaign, and her vengeance is at first sight purely personal and unrelated to political issues.[26]

Pheretime of the *History* dies in Egypt. She returns there immediately after punishing the Barcians, and dies a horrible death, seething with worms (4. 205). Herodotus does not explain why the queen goes to Egypt, but it seems likely that after her terrible act of revenge, she found it safer to be away from Libya, even if, as we shall see, her grandson was on the throne in Cyrene. Herodotus links Pheretime's painful illness and death with her cruel punishment of the Barcians, stating that the gods find excessive acts of vengeance abhorrent (4. 205), and this is a rare instance of the historian discussing divine envy in his own voice.[27] The Halicarnassian uses the queen's tale to demonstrate how those who transgress conventional boundaries are punished by the gods.[28] In fact, Herodotus seems chiefly interested in Pheretime as a moral figure rather than a political doer and in the Herodotean scheme of things, the queen's terrible death—the fact that she was eaten alive by worms—is far more illuminating and important than, for instance, the question of her successor on the throne.[29] Pheretime's wormy death influenced later Greek historians who also exploited the moralistic value of phthiriasis and assigned other tyrants a similar end.[30]

Menecles' Pheretime

Let us turn, finally, to ADM's choice of source, Menecles, and his account of Pheretime. After Arcesilaus dies, Menecles' queen sends those who opposed her son (τοὺς ἀντιταξαμένους τῷ υἱῷ)—this seems to be a circumlocution for "those who killed her son"—to Egypt. ADM does not tell us how, where, or why Pheretime's son has died, but the subsequent mention of Arcesilaus' opponents, their exile, and

[26] Cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993 and Brosius 1996, 4, 112–113, 118–120 for two attempts to explain (away) Amestris' deeds.
[27] Immerwahr 1966, 313.
[28] Dewald 1981, 118 n. 24; Lateiner 1989, 138–139.
[29] See e.g. Chamoux 158–159; Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 F5 (iiia, 226); Corcella 1993, xxxii–xxxiii and 390 (ad Hdt. 4. 205).
[30] See Africa 1982.

Pheretime's revenge indicate that in Menecles' version, too, he was assassinated. Only later does the queen have these opponents executed and this tactic of first sending enemies abroad and then killing them there is similar to a plan conceived by her son in the *History*. The Herodotean Arcesilaus, after re-establishing himself on the throne, killed some of his opponents in Cyrene itself but sent others off to Cyprus—where Pheretime may have been at the time—to be destroyed.[31] Arranging for one's opponents to be executed far from home must involve a ruse of some kind, for surely it is simpler and more economical to deal with such enemies at home, particularly if the intention is to kill—and not exile—them. Jacoby suggests that Pheretime sent these opponents of Arcesilaus as an embassy to Egypt;[32] she may have used a different pretext to be rid of them. Whatever her excuse, their dispatch indicates both that Pheretime was too weak to deal with them on the spot and that she was cunning and persuasive enough to convince them to go.

The queen eventually kills her son's opponents: ADM's summary is too brief to let us know whether all the Cyrenians put to death by Pheretime in Egypt actually participated in the murder of Arcesilaus or some were simply political opponents. The wording in our notice—ἐπιπαραγενομένη δὲ αὐτὴ πάντας ἀνεῖλε—is difficult. We do not know if the αὐτὴ here is emphatic and goes with πάντας ἀνεῖλε rather than ἐπιπαραγενομένη: in other words, we cannot determine whether in Menecles' account Pheretime executes her son's enemies by herself, just as she does in Herodotus, or if she has others carry out her orders. There is no adverb attached to ἀνεῖλε here, nothing like the word πικρῶς used in relation to the queen's later treatment of the Cyrenians, so perhaps in Menecles' narrative Pheretime killed these men in a fairly straightforward manner, with none of the lingering tortures described in the *History*. In any event, Menecles' queen, like the Herodotean Pheretime, is unable to carry out her revenge on her son's enemies on her own without a male ally. She too needs the aid of the Persian satrap Aryandes and uses her powers of persuasion to win him over to her cause.

ADM tells us that Aryandes also supplied Pheretime with an army which she used for repressing the Cyrenians. Presumably, then,

[31] These prisoners were in fact saved by the Cnidians and sent to Thera—Hdt. 4. 164; cf. a similar situation at 3. 48.

[32] Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 F5 (iiia, 225).

Menecles told of renewed stasis in Cyrene—which arose after Pheretime took control of the city, proclaimed her grandson king, and exiled her opponents—and the queen uses this army against her fellow citizens in her native land.[33] The phrase "subdued the Cyrenians harshly" (πικρῶς ἐχειρώσατο) found in our text certainly hints at cruel behavior on Pheretime's part towards the Cyrenians, but it is possible that Menecles' queen was not quite the savage figure she is in Herodotus.

It is unfortunate that our anonymous author gives no indication of how Menecles has Pheretime die. If the Libyan writer did include a painful death along Herodotean lines, we might expect ADM to hint at her plight and the addition of a single word—e.g. δεινῶς or κακῶς ἐτελεύτησε (cf. πικρῶς ἐχειρώσατο)—would have sufficed. Either Menecles' queen had a more pleasant passing than that described by Herodotus or else ADM has glossed over her unhappy end. If Pheretime is indeed a more attractive figure in Menecles (and it is difficult to imagine how she could possibly be painted in blacker colors than those used by Herodotus), this may have been a factor which influenced our anonymous author when he preferred the Barcian.

Independent queen or regent?

Perhaps ADM chose Menecles as his source because the Barcian writer presented the Cyrenian queen from a different perspective. If the main emphasis in Herodotus is that Arcesilaus was murdered and must be avenged, here the stress seems to be on the fact that the king of Cyrene is dead and another Battiad must sit on the throne. There are several indications in our text that Menecles' Pheretime was no less concerned with power and the continuing rule of the Battiad dynasty than she was preoccupied by revenge. Pheretime attacks the Cyrenians and not the Barcians, as in Herodotus, and this difference in location—which Jacoby rightly emphasizes—is important and underlines a difference in orientation between Herodotus and Menecles.[34] According to the Halicarnassian, Barca is the scene

---

[33] See Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 F5 (iiia, 225); Mitchell 1966, 104; cf. Legrand 1945, 160 with n. 3.

[34] Cf. Aeneas Tacticus 37. 6 and Aristotle περὶ πολιτειῶν fr. 611. 16 (Rose) and see Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 F5 (iiia, 225).

of Arcesilaus' murder and Pheretime's objective in going to war there is revenge, pure and simple: Herodotus' queen is above all a vengeful mother. The attack on Cyrene found here, which apparently took place after Arcesilaus' opponents were killed in Egypt, shows the Cyrenian queen of *DM*, Menecles' Pheretime, fighting for control of her land. This Pheretime concentrates on the continuation of the Battiad throne.

Another indication that Menecles' Pheretime was interested in the preservation of power is the fact that she arranges for her grandson to rule. *DM* is the sole surviving source where we are specifically told that Pheretime's *grandson* succeeds to the throne and that it is the queen herself who puts him there. This grandson is presumably the son of Arcesilaus III and must be Battus IV or Βάττος ὁ καλός who, according to Heraclides' summary of Aristotle's *Constitutions* (fr. 611. 17 Rose), was the seventh king in the Battiad dynasty. Although Herodotus mentions an oracle (which is clearly *post eventum*) which allots the Battiads eight generations of dominion in Cyrene—four rulers named Battus and four named Arcesilaus (Hdt. 4. 163. 2)—his account of the Battiads ends with the capture of Barca and the death of Pheretime, i.e. after six kings or generations of rule. Herodotus reports that Pheretime returns to Egypt shortly after the conquest of Barca and dies there, but he does not indicate who is in control of Cyrene at the time and he tells us nothing of the last two Battiad kings. Polyaenus in his account of Pheretime (8. 47) confirms Menecles' report, stating in a more general way that the Cyrenian queen restored the dominion of Cyrene to her family.[35]

The language of our notice is again difficult: what does αὐτὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Κυρήνης κατέσχε ("took over the rule of Cyrene herself") mean? Did Pheretime obtain control of the throne—note the aorist κατέσχε—only in order to hand it over immediately to her grandson or did she actually rule Cyrene herself? Perhaps she acted as regent for her grandson, who may still have been a minor. If Menecles' queen did in fact govern independently, this could be a reason for ADM to choose her over Herodotus' queen.

---

[35] For the little that is known of the reign of Battus IV see Mitchell 1966, 104–108 and Chamoux 1953, 160–168.

Pheretime's stratagem

This brings us to the most puzzling word in our brief notice, δόλῳ—cf. "when her son died by trickery took over the rule". Which phrase does the word δόλῳ in our text modify? Did Arcesilaus die by means of some trick, according to Menecles, or did Pheretime take over the rule of Cyrene by deception?[36] The wording here does not allow us to decide which of the two alternatives is correct. If in Menecles' account Arcesilaus III was indeed killed by trickery, this would put the Cyrenian queen in a position very similar to that of Tomyris, the only other bereaved mother found in *DM*. But perhaps it is Pheretime who uses trickery.

In the Suda, Pheretime is assigned a rather complicated deception, a trick which Herodotus says was used by the Persian commander Amasis during the siege of Barca. According to the *History* (4. 200–201), the Persian army sent by Aryandes from Egypt to Barca besieges the city for 9 months. The Persians try mining operations in addition to direct assaults, but are unable to capture Barca by force. Amasis then decides to use trickery (δόλῳ) instead. He digs a trench, covers it with planks and earth, and invites the enemy to that very spot, where they negotiate a peace agreement. Their covenant is to last as long as the earth remains as it is. The Persians then expose the trench, allowing them to break their oath and subjugate the Barcians. In the Suda it is Pheretime who sticks to the letter (but not the spirit) of an oath, uncovering a trench, and then advancing into the city.[37] Elsewhere in the Suda there is a description of a woman digging a trench and then hiding it by covering it with earth and this clearly is another bit of the same account where Pheretime is shown using the stratagem of the hidden ditch.[38] In other words, an unknown author who served (directly or indirectly) as the source for the two articles in the Suda, includes a variation on the tale in Herodotus according to which Pheretime, rather than the Persian Amasis, serves as the duplicitous conqueror of a city. (The Suda sim-

[36] Cf. Jacoby (*FGrH* on 270 F5 = iiia, 224–225) who thinks that δόλῳ describes the manner of Arcesilaus' death and yet suggests that Menecles' Pheretime used a stratagem of some kind when she sent her son's enemies off to Egypt (thus enabling her to obtain the throne).

[37] Cf. Suda s.v. ἐμπεδορκεῖν: ἐμπέδως τηρεῖν τὰ ὅρκια. ἡ δὲ Φερετίμα τὸν ὄροφον ὑποσπάσασα τοῦ βόθρου ὡς ἂν ἐμπεδορκοίη, ἤλαυνεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. See Wheeler 1984 for other such sophistic interpretations of treaties.

[38] Suda s.v. ἐπεφόρησε; cf. de Boor 1890, 478–479.

ply states ἤλαυνεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν and we cannot tell which city—Barca or Cyrene—figured in the revised tale.) In this author's narrative, Pheretime is at the heart of the military action and she brings about the downfall of the city, rather than having the Persians do the conquering for her, as in Herodotus. Who is the Suda's source here?[39] Could it be Menecles? If we accept Jacoby's view of Menecles as a scholar who collected stories from earlier accounts of Cyrene, this may simply mean that the Barcian found the tale in some earlier history, included it in his Λιβυκαὶ ἱστορίαι, only to have bits of the story subsequently find their way (directly or through an intermediary) into the Suda. It is worth noting that several other entries in the Suda cite Menecles as a source, or to put it another way, several entries in the Suda furnish fragments of Menecles.[40]

Is the covered ditch subterfuge the δόλος referred to here in *DM*? This would mean assuming that (1) Menecles is the Suda's (direct or indirect) source and (2) he attributed Amasis' ruse in Herodotus to Pheretime. (3) It was due to this trick that Pheretime gained sovereignty over Cyrene, i.e. (4) the besieged city was Cyrene, not Barca. If this series of assumptions is correct, we would have an immediate explanation as to why ADM, when telling of Pheretime, preferred the account of an obscure author to that of Herodotus, the writer whom he summarizes most frequently. If Menecles' Pheretime was a cunning ruler who successfully conducted a siege, she would be a true warrior queen, much closer in spirit to several other women in *DM* than Herodotus' vengeful virago.

Eryxo

Pheretime was not the first Battiad queen to take matters into her own hands and she bears some similarity to her mother-in-law, Eryxo. Herodotus has a very brief account of Eryxo (4. 160. 4), merely stating that she uses deception to put her husband's assassin to death,

---

[39] Nicolaus of Damascus, Diodorus Siculus, and Aelian have all been suggested as possible sources: cf. *FGrH* 90 F50; Diod. 8. 29–30; Suda s.v. εὐλαί. See de Boor 1890 and cf. Jacoby ad *FGrH* 270 F5 (iiia, 224).

[40] Two of the Suda fragments (s.vv. Ἑρμαῖ and Κεραμεικός = *FGrH* 370 F2, F4a) are attributed to Μενεκλῆς ἢ Καλλικράτης and deal with Athenian matters. One of these citations is already found in Harpocration and the other comes from an Aristophanic scholiast, while the source of the third Suda entry (s.v. διακόνιον = *FGrH* 270 F8) quoting Μενεκλῆς... ἐν τῷ Γλωσσοκόμῳ is not known.

but Plutarch (*Mor.* 260e–261d) and Polyaenus (8. 41)—who, it is generally agreed, simply summarizes Plutarch—provide us with a fuller and possibly more accurate tale. Their version may, in fact, stem from Menecles.[41] Eryxo, like Pheretime, avenges the murder of the reigning Battiad monarch, who is of her immediate family—in this case, her husband, Arcesilaus II—and she too ensures that the Battiads continue to sit on the throne in Cyrene, having her young son, Battus the Lame, proclaimed king. Both women win over to their side a powerful ally in Egypt, for Eryxo succeeds in charming the formerly hostile king Amasis. Nonetheless Eryxo, unlike Pheretime, is quite a positive figure: Plutarch terms her σώφρων ... καὶ φιλάνθρωπος.[42] Perhaps Eryxo has a more favorable reputation because, although she does use duplicitous means to execute her husband's killer, she does not bloody her own hands. Eryxo's brother Polyarchus and two young assistants murder the unarmed Learchus, after Eryxo tricks him into visiting her. Thus Eryxo schemes and plots in order to avenge her husband's murder and perpetuate Battiad rule, but she is neither as independent nor as militant as Pheretime. Eryxo asks for no armies and does not act as regent for her young son—that role is undertaken first by Learchus and then by Polycrates. So too when the queen goes on her diplomatic mission to Egypt, she is accompanied both by her brother and her mother. Eryxo apparently prefers to act behind the scenes and despite the similar roles they play in Battiad history, Eryxo seems more of a conventional queen than her daughter-in-law, Pheretime. This may be one reason why Eryxo's story is not included by ADM, even if Menecles did write about her as well. If it is true that our anonymous author prefers to describe only *one* woman from each nationality or ethnic group (above, p. 11), Pheretime is the more appropriate of the two Cyrenian queens.

Polyaenus' version

Before leaving Pheretime, let us look at Polyaenus' version of her adventures (8. 47); it is an interesting combination of Herodotus' tale[43]

[41] See Stadter 1965, 117–118.

[42] *Mor.* 260 f; cf. Polyaenus 8. 41 σώφρων γυνὴ καὶ δικαιοτάτη and see Legrand 1945, 162 with n. 1.

[43] See Melber 1885, 477–480 who argues that Polyaenus' source was acquainted only with Hdt. 4. 162–167 but not with 4. 200–205; cf. Mitchell 1966, 104 and Knott 1884, 66–67.

and a more feminist, Menecles-like version. Thus Polyaenus' Pheretime, like Herodotus' Cyrenian queen, appeals to Euelthon of Salamis for military aid while Arcesilaus is still alive, and flees to Egypt after her cruel son is killed by neighboring barbarians.[44] She too reminds Aryandes of her son's medism and is granted an army and a navy by the Persian satrap. Polyaenus then parts company with Herodotus and states that Pheretime attacked the Cyrenians. The irresistible queen was victorious (ἀνυπόστατος—this seems to suggest victory by force rather than trickery), Polyaenus concludes his account, and succeeded both in avenging her son's death and restoring the rule of Cyrene to her family. In other words, Polyaenus' Pheretime blends Herodotean vengeance with Meneclean interest in the continuation of the Battiad dynasty. She is described in flattering, rhetorical language[45] and seems to lead the Persian forces by herself: there is no mention, at any rate, of any male commanders.[46] Polyaenus' Pheretime, like Menecles' Cyrenian queen, is an independent, militant figure, and it has been suggested that Polyaenus' source was an anthology of ἀρεταὶ γυναικῶν, a collection such as ours telling of the manly courage and boldness of women.[47] Can we assume that Polyaenus' purported source is related to *DM* itself? It is unlikely that Polyaenus' account of Pheretime was ultimately derived from Menecles. Both authors agree that Cyrene, rather than Barca, was the scene of Pheretime's military activities, but the two brief narratives are not altogether similar. In Menecles, for instance, the Cyrenian queen withdraws to Egypt and dies there; in Polyaenus this does not seem to be the case. A great deal of Polyaenus' account is clearly dependent upon Herodotus, and we should not assume a direct link between Menecles and Polyaenus. It is worth remembering in this context the brief references in the Suda to a siege conducted by Pheretime. All three sources, Menecles, Polyaenus, and the Suda, assign Pheretime—be it independently or otherwise—a prominent military role and it seems likely that the Cyrenian queen, like Semiramis and Dido, regularly featured in catalogues telling of

[44] Or Barcians, if we accept the emendation of Melber 1885, 478.

[45] Φερετίμα πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν οὐκ ἀπηγόρευσεν ... ἀνυπόστατος ἐγένετο ...—cf. Melber 1885, 478–479.

[46] Cf. πολλὴν δύναμιν ... συλλαβοῦσα, προσβαλοῦσα τοῖς Κυρηναίοις 8. 47 and contrast Polyaenus 7. 34.

[47] Melber 1885, 479.

remarkable women, with various versions and variations of her tale in circulation.

ADM's choice

Let us return to our opening question—why Menecles? One possibility is that ADM found Menecles' text easier and more convenient to summarize than Herodotus, even if the *Libyan Histories* was less widely available than the Halicarnassian's work. Herodotus' account of Pheretime is found in two distinct sections and a long excursus on Libya separates the two parts, while Menecles' tale of the Cyrenian queen was perhaps more concentrated, with no digressions and excurses. This explanation is not really satisfactory, since elsewhere ADM shows himself capable of summarizing material scattered over several different sections of the *History*. Another possibility is that our anonymous author considered a local historian's account of Cyrenian affairs more trustworthy than Herodotus' version. But the most likely factor behind ADM's choice of author is that Menecles' tale of the Cyrenian queen better fits the overall scheme of *DM* somehow.

If ADM chose Menecles' *Libyan Histories* because of its departures from Herodotus, it is an unfortunate paradox that the very brief, Procrustean format of the notices in *DM* causes many of these differences virtually to disappear. We have seen that there are several ways in which Menecles' queen may have differed from Herodotus' Pheretime. The Barcian *may* have described Pheretime as commanding Persian forces herself and told how she used cunning and trickery to end a siege and enter a city. This would make Menecles' queen a more warlike and militant figure than in Herodotus. The Cyrenian queen of *DM* seems as concerned with the continuation of Battiad rule as she is with avenging her son's death and may even have sat on the throne in her own right, so perhaps it was her role in the governing of Cyrene that attracted ADM to the Barcian's version. Conceivably, Menecles' queen was a more restrained and attractive figure than Herodotus' vengeful harridan, with a less ugly death. In sum, Menecles' Pheretime may have been more gentle, more militant, or more of an independent sovereign than Herodotus' queen and it is a measure of our ignorance of ADM that we are unable to determine which of these alternatives would have been most attractive to the anonymous compiler of our catalogue.

Thargelia

Sources: Aeschines Socraticus frr. 21–22 Dittmar = Plutarch *Pericles* 24; *DM* 11; Hesychius s.v. Θαργηλία; Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Θαργηλία; Suda s.v. Θαργηλία; Philostratus *epistulae* 73. See also Hippias *FGrH* 6 F3 = DK 86 B4 = Athenaeus 608f.
Related Sources: Lucian *Eunuchus* 7.

Thargelia is a Milesian hetaira who pursued a vigorous pro-Persian policy. We know of two early writers who told of Thargelia, Hippias and Aeschines, and the two accounts, taken together, provide us with an unusual picture of a woman who uses her charms for political purposes. Hippias emphasizes Thargelia's seductive side and notes that the Milesian woman was outstandingly beautiful, as well as clever: she was, he adds, married 14 times. In Aeschines, Thargelia is similarly attractive. Thargelia, the daughter of Agesagoras, came to Thessaly, Aeschines relates, and married the local ruler, Antiochus. After his death she campaigned for the Persian cause, attaching herself to many powerful Greek men in order to win them over to the Persian side. Her influence, we are told, leads to the establishment of several pro-Persian regimes. We can easily reconcile Hippias' account with that of Aeschines if we assume that Thargelia's 14 "husbands" are these important Greek men. In our notice, which is based on that of Aeschines (see immediately below), ADM ignores Thargelia's physical charms and numerous lovers and, more surprisingly, omits any mention of Thargelia's political mission: he concentrates on her encounter with the Persian king, whom she meets—and parts with—on equal terms.

The Aspasia of Aeschines

ADM, uncharacteristically, does not name his source,[1] but it seems clear that it is Aeschines the Socratic, for Aeschines is our anonymous writer's authority for the notice on Rhodogyne and both these women, Thargelia and Rhodogyne, were described in the same dialogue, Aeschines' *Aspasia*. Our notice, with its repeated mention of Thessaly (βασιλεύοντος . . . Θετταλῶν ἀφικομένην εἰς Θετταλίαν . . .

[1] The only other notice with no source citation is that on Onomaris; see above, p. 29.

βασιλεῦσαι Θετταλίας) also seems to echo a Gorgianic turn of phrase found in Aeschines' original dialogue: Θαργηλία Μιλησία ἐλθοῦσα εἰς Θετταλίαν ξυνῆν Ἀντιόχῳ Θετταλῷ βασιλεύοντι πάντων Θετταλῶν.[2] This would mean that ADM consulted Aeschines' *Aspasia* directly and was influenced (consciously or otherwise) by the rhythms and word play of the original.

The *Aspasia*, according to the reconstructions of modern scholars, tells of a conversation between Socrates and Callias, in which the former recommends Aspasia as a teacher for the latter's son.[3] Callias is astounded at the idea that a woman can educate his son, particularly in the all important field of politics, and Socrates then tells the stories of Rhodogyne and Thargelia in order to illustrate how exceptional women can succeed in governing, just as Aspasia herself does. In other words, Aeschines apparently used the tales of these two extraordinary figures, Rhodogyne and Thargelia, as *exempla* to illustrate women's capacities as rulers and warriors, and this makes his *Aspasia* a particularly useful source for ADM (cf. above, p. 19). Thargelia is a middle figure between the two other women: she is like the independent warrior queen Rhodogyne in that she initiates her own policies, but the means Thargelia uses are those of the courtesan Aspasia.[4]

Hippias' collection

We have seen that Hippias also described Thargelia, telling of her beauty, cleverness, and 14 husbands, but there is no hint, as far as we can tell, of either Thessaly or Thargelia's political machinations. Hippias' brief description of Thargelia is the sole fragment which survives from his *Synagoge* or *Collection* and there is a great deal of scholarly speculation about the form and content of this work. It seems to have been an anthology of earlier writers of poetry and prose from Orpheus, Musaeus, Hesiod and Homer onwards, of "what is most important and belongs together" (τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ὁμόφυλα DK 86 B6). In the eyes of some, Hippias' composition was a survey of earlier religious and philosophical thought, and "stands at the very beginning of the writing of the history of philosophy".[5] If that is the

---

[2] Philostratus *ep.* 73; cf. Natorp 1892, 495.
[3] Dittmar 1912, 1–59; Taylor 1934; Kahn 1994; and esp. Ehlers 1966.
[4] Cf. Ehlers 1966, 55.
[5] Kerferd 1981, 48–49; cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 51–52.

case, why is the story of the much-married Thargelia included in Hippias' work? There are three small hints that Thargelia was somehow associated with philosophy. Lucian (*Eun.* 7) mentions Thargelia, along with Aspasia and Diotima, as instances of women who have studied philosophy, but this seems simply to be due to the fact that she, like the other two women, is found in a Socratic dialogue. Athenaeus (608 f.) tells us that Hippias described Thargelia as very beautiful and wise πάνυ καλὴ καὶ σοφή and commentators think that the phrase is a direct quotation from Hippias.[6] Plutarch also mention Thargelia's cleverness (χάριν ἔχουσα μετὰ δεινότητος *Per.* 24. 4), but he probably is referring to her political acumen. Finally there *may* be a reference in Hesychius to the fact that the Milesians honored Thargelia for her intelligence.[7] All in all, it is not likely that Hippias dwelt on Thargelia's philosophical abilities, and we cannot be certain that his *Collection* was, in fact, a history of philosophy. Other suggestions are that it was a catalogue of women, a survey of ethnic customs, or an anthology of the sophist's own writings.[8]

Both Aeschines and Hippias clearly base their accounts of Thargelia on earlier works, for Hippias' *Synagoge*—whatever its theme—is an anthology, while Aeschines, who was not a historian and uses Thargelia as an *exemplum*, must have heard of her tale elsewhere. Ehlers suggests that Aeschines used Hellanicus' *Thessalica* as a source, because of the story's Thessalian background; the Socratic was probably acquainted with Hippias' account as well.[9] In any event, this means that there was at least one additional early work which told of Thargelia and perhaps ADM's use of the word φασί in our notice refers to that source as well.

The historical background

The historical background to our story is authentic: we know that Antiochus, son of Echecratidas and Dyseris, was ruler or *tagos*[10] of

---

6 Osann 1843, 505 compares Pl. *Hipp. Mai.* 281a Ἱππίας ὁ καλός τε καὶ σοφός; cf. Tarrant 1928, xxv. Hawley 1993, 78–80 and 1994, 82 and 84 notes that intellectually clever Greek women are almost invariably described as beautiful as well.

7 Hesychius s.v. Θαργήλια (the festival, not the woman) has a corrupt sentence which may concern our Thargelia: καὶ παρὰ Μιλησίοις διὰ τιμῆς ἀγομένη (?ᾀδομένη) ἐπὶ φρονήσει. See Dittmar 1912, 30–31 n. 109.

8 See above, p. 29 with n. 65 and cf. Jacoby ad *FGrH* 6 F3 (i 478 and 542).

9 Ehlers 1966, 62; see Dittmar 1912, 30.

10 For the history and use of the term *tagos* see Robertson 1976, 104–107.

Thessaly from about 530–520. Simonides, who wrote a *Threnos* for him (*PMG* 528), is the chief source for Antiochus' dates.[11] This *Threnos* may be identical with the one Simonides wrote for his patron Scopas (of the *Protagoras* poem), whose whole family died in the collapse of a hall. (Simonides, it should be recalled, was rescued by the Dioscuri). Quintilian reports that Scopas' nephew is said to have been killed then and Antiochus may well be this nephew.[12] We do not know why Thargelia left Miletus and came to Thessaly, nor do we know anything of her relationship with Antiochus. In other sources we hear only of Antiochus' mother mourning the (presumably early) death of her son.[13] Since Antiochus is thought to have died about 520 or 515 BC,[14] while Xerxes invaded Greece in 480 BC, Thargelia's "reign" (whatever its actual form) can be dated to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century BC.

There is also considerable evidence for the Thessalians' pro-Persian activities. Antiochus lived before the time of Xerxes and it is generally agreed that he did not medize,[15] but subsequently, the Aleuads, one of the great families of Thessaly, were among the very first Greeks to urge Xerxes to invade Greece (Hdt. 7. 6; cf. 7. 130). Thorax, the oldest of the Aleuads, will later escort Xerxes safely out of Greece, and openly allow Mardonius in (9. 1; cf. 9. 58). While other Thessalians may have objected at first to this policy of the Aleuads, ultimately the Thessalians medized (7. 172–174).[16]

Thargelia's reign

What evidence is there for Thargelia herself? Modern scholars are willing to concede that Thargelia played a significant part in the decision of the Thessalians to medize, but they assign her a secondary role, as a persuasive power behind the scenes. Ehlers contends that Thargelia was not actually an independent ruler, but was close to the throne, through her various lovers, while Morrison speaks of the medizing Aleuads as the "patrons" of Thargelia.[17] Other scholars

---

[11] Meyer 1909, 243–245.
[12] Quintilian 11. 2. 14 = *PMG* 510; see Morrison 1942, 60–61.
[13] Aristeides 31.2 = *PMG* 528.
[14] Westlake 1936, 15–16; Meyer 1909, 244.
[15] Meyer 1909, 244–245; Westlake 1936, 15–16; Ehlers 1966, 53.
[16] Brunt 1993, 80–83 is a recent discussion of Thessalian medism; see too Robertson 1976.
[17] Ehlers 1966, 54–55; Morrison 1942, 60 n. 5.

see Antiochus' widow virtually as part of the *tagia* in Thessaly and conjecture that she was the wife of successive *tagi* after Antiochus' death: this, they say, then led to the story of her 30 year rule and 14 husbands. As purported wife of Thorax, Thargelia is allowed to have been responsible for the opening of negotiations between the Aleuads and Mardonius.[18]

But in ancient sources—in Aeschines and certainly in *DM*—Thargelia is an autonomous ruler. ADM presents her as the queen, presumably the *tagos* of Thessaly: Thargelia, as is often the case in *DM*, simply takes over after her husband's death. Her activities and influence were not necessarily restricted to Thessaly, for Plutarch says she was instrumental in introducing pro-Persian regimes in several Greek cities. Thargelia sends the men she influences back home to their own cities while she continues to rule in Thessaly. It is surely significant that it is she (and not Thorax, for instance), who receives the Persian king.

Thargelia and Aspasia

Thargelia is particularly interesting because she uses womanly weapons (charm, seduction etc.) to achieve traditionally masculine aims (political change), deliberately cultivating men in order to bring about a medizing policy. In Aeschines' *Aspasia* Thargelia seems to have served as evidence that not all Ionian women were simply interested in sexual affairs and money.[19] ADM ignores the seductive, hetaira-like side to Thargelia's character and only records her most outstanding political achievement, her successful meeting with Xerxes. Aspasia is said to have been a great admirer of Thargelia, but there is a crucial difference between the two women, for Thargelia rules on her own. Both Ionians are beautiful, compelling women who use their considerable powers to wield political influence, but Aspasia is only a power behind the scenes and does not act independently. Aspasia supposedly trains Pericles in oratory,[20] and after his death, marries again and transforms her second husband Lysicles—allegedly a simple sheep merchant—into a leading politician by teaching him to speak.[21] But

[18] Meyer 1909, 243 n. 3; cf. Westlake 1936, 16.

[19] Cf. Athen. 220b = fr. 20 Dittmar; see too Dittmar 1912, 19 and Ehlers 1966, 51.

[20] Pl. *Menex.* 235e; cf. Aeschines frr. 23–24 Dittmar.

[21] Aeschines frr. 26–27 Dittmar; cf. Ehlers 1966, 73–85 and Kahn 1994, 97–98 on Lysicles' role in the *Aspasia*.

it is Lysicles and Pericles who are the actual doers: Aspasia can only pursue her political aims through them. Clever though Aspasia may be, she is, in a sense, no different from Herodotus' Persian queen Atossa, who in her famous bedroom scene with Darius, urges the king to attack Greece (Hdt. 3. 134); there are many queens in Ctesias' *Persica* who exhibit this kind of petticoat influence.[22] Even the courtesan Rhodopis is more independent than Aspasia, for she uses the money she earns to build a monument to herself (Hdt. 2. 134–135).[23] Thargelia, on the other hand, may have started her career as a Milesian hetaira, but she is eventually able to hold her own with the Persian king.

Xerxes and Thargelia

This element in Thargelia's tale, her encounter with Xerxes (who is not actually named in our notice), is particularly intriguing and it is unfortunate that *DM* is our sole source for the story, with no further details on what actually happened. What was the relationship between Thargelia and Xerxes? Under what circumstances did they meet? Why does she pursue her medizing policy so actively? What does it mean that Xerxes left her in no way diminished? Did she outmaneuver him in some way? We may well imagine that there was some colorful story in Aeschines (or Aeschines' source) on the meeting between the two, with Xerxes being swayed by her charms. Xerxes, in Herodotus *History* at any rate, is quite susceptible to the influence of women. He becomes entangled with Masistes' wife and daughter, and is unable to resist the importunations of either Artaynte or Amestris (Hdt. 9. 108–112). He also accedes, at first, to the pleas of Sataspes' mother (4. 43) and is completely fooled by Artemisia's machinations (below, p. 208).[24] Dittmar suggests that Thargelia was the mistress of the Persian king from the very start and arrived in Thessaly as part of her pro-Persian activities, but this is unlikely.[25] We may imagine that she supported the Persian cause out of selfish

[22] These figures in Greek historians do not necessarily reflect the actual role of Persian royal women at court—see Brosius 1996, 81–84 etc. and above, p. 156.
[23] Cf. Ehlers 57 n. 77.
[24] Cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1989, esp. 554–555 who argues against the perception of Xerxes as a womanizer.
[25] Dittmar 1912, 27–28; cf. Ehlers 52 n. 65 and 56 n. 76.

political interests, rather than love, and hoped to gain something substantial in return for her efforts.

Did Xerxes visit her on his way to Greece or on the way back? We have already seen that Thorax, head of the Aleuads, is said by Herodotus (9. 1) to have guided Xerxes on his way out of Greece, and this may have been the occasion of Thargelia's meeting with the king. Whenever the encounter took place, Thargelia handled herself well. The example of Pythius (7. 27–29; 38–39) shows how even a staunch ally of Xerxes who welcomes the Persian warmly cannot be confident that he will be left inviolate by the king's visit, but Thargelia receives the king and sends him on his way, in no way lessened (μηδὲν ἐλαττωθεῖσαν—the crucial phrase in our tale) by the encounter. Here, Thargelia reminds us of Artemisia, another independent female ruler who is well able to hold her own with Xerxes.

Thargelia's end

Thargelia, ADM tells us, ruled for 30 years in all.[26] According to the Suda, she was assassinated by an Argive whom she had earlier imprisoned. Again, we would like to know more details about this incident, which certainly sounds dramatic. It seems most likely, at any rate, that Thargelia was killed because of her political activities, rather than some romantic affair, and that in death as in life, she was more a ruler than a courtesan.

ADM as editor

Thargelia is especially interesting because she possesses qualities traditionally associated with both genders, combining beauty and seductiveness with political power, but this is not apparent from her notice in *DM.* The considerable amount of information relating to Thargelia found in other sources allows us to see how ADM chose to edit and present her tale. There is not even a hint in *DM* that Thargelia was an exceptionally beautiful hetaira and we hear nothing of her many lovers, even though they were important leaders whom she influenced politically. ADM presents Thargelia at the peak of

[26] Compare Semiramis' 42 year reign, also noted by ADM and cf. Ehlers 1966, 53 who thinks that 30 is just a convenient round number.

her political power: a woman ruler of Thessaly able to deal with the most outstanding figure of her time, the Persian king, as an equal. He does not seem interested in the means Thargelia uses to achieve political success and she emerges in our notice a more one-sided figure than she actually was.

TOMYRIS

Source: Herodotus 1. 204–216.
Related Sources: Diodorus Siculus 2. 44. 1–2; [Tibullus] 4. 1. 143; Strabo 11. 6. 2, 11. 8. 5–6; Valerius Maximus 9. 10 ext. 1; Frontinus *Strategemata* 2. 5. 5; Theon *Progymnasmata* 9; Lucian *Charon* 13; Polyaenus 8. 28; Justin 1. 8; Ampelius *Liber Memorialis* 13. 1; Ammianus Marcellinus 23. 6. 7; Ambrosius *epistulae* 18. 36; Sidonius Apollinaris *Carmina* 9. 30–37; Orosius *Historia adversus paganos* 2. 7; Suda s.v. Τόμυρις.[1]

Tomyris the Massagetan

Tomyris[2] is the quintessential woman warrior. Strabo (11. 8. 6) states that her story was immensely popular with ancient writers and the many surviving sources dealing with her indicate the truth of his words. One can well understand the attractions of the Massagetan queen: she, a woman, defeated the most powerful man of her time, the Persian king, in battle, and Cyrus' death is a memorable, bloodthirsty affair. The tale is not just a military one, for Tomyris is an anguished mother who avenges the death of her son. The queen is also a true Massagetan, a unique combination of wise and wild.

Let us begin with the Massagetae. The Massagetae were a nomadic people of Central Asia in what is now Turkestan. Herodotus is careful to explain that they are similar to—but not identical with—the Scythians.[3] Other ancient writers seem to view the Massagetae as Scythians, and Tomyris is often called a Scythian queen in later sources.[4] Lucian, whose account clearly is based on Herodotus, uses the two terms interchangeably, first referring to Tomyris as Massagetan

---

[1] See Ziegler 1937 for a complete survey of sources.

[2] While the mss. of *DM* read Τώμυρις, Herodotus has Τόμυρις throughout, as do Polyaenus, Lucian, Theon, and the Suda. Ammianus Marcellinus, Sidonius, and Ampelius also have *Tomyris* while elsewhere she is either *Tamyris* (Justin and ps.-Tibullus) or *Thamyris* (Frontinus, Valerius Maximus, Orosius); see Ziegler 1937, 1702. According to one etymology her name is derived from Turkic and means "Iron Maiden", but the name may be of Iranian origin—see Cook 1983, 37 and 235 n. 32.

[3] Hdt. 1. 215 vs. 1. 201; 1. 216; 4. 11; cf. Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 971–974.

[4] Massagetae as Scythians: Strabo 11. 6. 2, 11. 8. 2, 11. 8. 8; Diodorus Siculus 2. 43. 5; Stephanus Byzantius *Ethnica* s.v. Μασσαγέται; cf. Cook 1983, 194–195. Tomyris a Scythian queen: Frontinus *Strat.* 2. 5. 5; Justin 1. 8. 1; Ammianus Marcellinus 23. 6. 7 etc.

and then Scythian, while Polyaenus, Theon, Strabo and the Suda all call her Massagetan.[5]

Herodotus tells us a great deal about the Massagetan way of life[6] and almost all his information is directly relevant to the encounter between Cyrus and Tomyris. (1) *Sexual mores.* While there were legitimate marriages among the Massagetae, women were held in common so that wives were available to other interested men. Such unions did not take place out in the open (as with other more animal-like peoples described in the *History*),[7] but inside covered wagons. The amorous man would hang up his quiver outside the wagon and the couple would proceed without fear (Hdt. 1. 216. 1). (2) *Burial customs.* Very old people are sacrificed, boiled with other animals, and then eaten by their relatives; the sick are buried and not eaten and this is considered a calamity (1. 216. 2–3). (3) *Use of metals.* The Massagetae use bronze and gold, which is found in abundance in their country, but have no silver or iron (1. 215). (4) *Food.* The Massegetae, we are told, have no agriculture, but eat meat and fish; they drink milk and no wine (1. 216. 3–4).[8] (5) *Religious observance.* They worship only one god, the sun, to whom they sacrifice only horses (1. 216. 4). (6) *Warfare.* The Massagetae fight both on and off horseback and use bows, spears, and bills as weapons (1. 215. 1–2).

There is a close relation, on several levels, between these Massagetan customs, and the unfolding of the Tomyris-Cyrus tale in Herodotus. Thus Cyrus can, for instance, try to propose marriage to the widowed Tomyris, for the Massagetae recognize the institution of marriage. The Massagetan soldiers are tricked and captured because they are unused to Persian grains and any kind of wine. So too an angry Tomyris invokes the sun god while swearing an oath to Cyrus, and the fierce, final battle between the Persians and Massagetae is a vivid demonstration of the various ways and weapons of Massagetan warfare. But the reflection of Massagetan ways runs deeper than this: the lack of technology and abundance of gold hint at the role the Massagetae play in defeating the "civilized" Persian aggressors, for

---

[5] Lucian *Charon* 13; Polyaenus 8. 28; Theon *Progym.* 9; Strabo 11. 6. 2, 11. 8. 5–6; Suda s.v. Τόμυρις. Tomyris may also be the figure hiding behind the unnamed Sacian queen who crucifies the captured Cyrus, according to Diodorus Siculus (2. 44. 2); cf. Weissbach 1924, 1156–1157.

[6] Cf. Strabo 11. 8. 6.

[7] Cf. Hdt. 1. 203; 3. 101; 4. 180.

[8] Cf. 1. 207. 6; 1. 212. 2.

they are portrayed as noble savages of a golden age.[9] Finally, as Rossellini and Saïd have demonstrated so well, Massagetan mores, especially those relating to women and the dead, are not simply barbaric. Both the sexual behavior and anthropophagy of the Massagetae are limited and regulated, and the Massagetae occupy an ambiguous position between savagery and civilization.[10] Tomyris represents in her dealings with Cyrus a peculiar combination of moderation and bloodthirstiness, wisdom and savagery, and is, then, a true Massagetan.

Inheriting the kingdom

Like many of the women of *DM*, Tomyris is queen by virtue of the fact that her husband, the king, has died (Hdt. 1. 205. 1). ADM does not even mention this husband and in Herodotus he is an anonymous, nondescript figure, whose sole role is to bequeath his kingdom to his wife. Cyrus' original approach to Tomyris is based on the fact that she is a widow, for he proposes marriage. The Persian king wants to marry Tomyris simply in order to acquire her territory. Cyrus' plan to inherit the Massagetan kingdom peaceably through his new wife is a peculiarly Persian concept: "claim by dowry" is not a practice found among the (post-Homeric) Greeks, Babylonians, or Egyptians, but recurs several times in stories meant to assert the legitimacy of Persian rule over various territories.[11] ADM omits all mention of this deceptive marriage proposal; in Herodotus the queen sees through Cyrus and rejects his suit. Only after this trick does not succeed does the Persian king begin to build a bridge as a prelude to invading Massagetan territory and achieving his aim by warfare.

Two Herodotean motifs

Cyrus intends to cross the Araxes river and invade Tomyris' territory, but ADM does not mention the bridge or the river. The Araxes is a natural physical boundary which serves to define and protect

---

[9] Flory 1987, 94–97, 116–117; Benardete 1969, 28–29; Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 971; cf. Gould 1989, 101–105.

[10] Rossellini and Saïd 1971, esp. 966–971.

[11] Atkinson 1956, 173–176.

Massagetan territory[12] and the river is an important feature—symbolic as well as geographic—in Herodotus' account of Cyrus' campaign against the Massagetae. When Cyrus crosses the Araxes on an expansionist offensive, he is crossing a moral as well as a physical limit and dire consequences follow this "transgression".[13] In the *History*, Croesus, Darius, and Xerxes transgress in similar fashion when they cross the Halys, Ister, and Hellespont respectively and they too suffer defeat after trespassing. Is ADM aware that "hybris, the river and the sober-living people on the other side of the water are recurrent elements in Herodotus' reports on ill-fated expeditions of Persian kings"?[14]

Our notice *does* contain another Herodotean motif, the contrast between living peaceably in one's own territory (ἡσυχάζειν) and the passion to attack (cf. ἐπιθυμοίη πολεμεῖν) and rule others. The verbs ἐπιθυμέω and προθυμέω—to desire or covet—are often used by Herodotus in relation to Persian expansionist aims. Cyrus, we are told, desired (ἐπεθύμησε 1. 201; cf. ἔσχε προθυμίην 1. 204. 1) to subdue the Massagetans. The Ethiopian king says that Cambyses is unjust, for if he were just he would not desire (οὔτ' ἂν ἐπεθύμησε 3. 21. 2) any territory other than his own, while Darius sets out on his expedition against the Scythians because of his desire for revenge (ἐπεθύμησε . . . τείσασθαι 4. 1). Finally, in a notable passage (7. 18. 2–3), Artabanus links Xerxes' imminent invasion of Greece with the earlier imperialist campaigns of Cyrus against the Massagetae, Cambyses against the Ethiopians, and Darius against the Scythians. These earlier failures, says Artabanus, all demonstrated that it is bad to desire much (τὸ πολλῶν ἐπιθυμέειν) and caused him to think that Xerxes would be happiest if he lived in peace (ἀτρεμίζοντα).[15] ADM includes this theme in our brief notice, but we do not know if he is deliberately reproducing a recurring motif from the *History* or simply summarizing Tomyris' words.

---

[12] See Cook 1983, 37 and 194; Legrand 1970, 194 n. 1; Hartog 1988, 33 n. 84 for the identification of the Araxes and the location of the Massagetae relative to it.

[13] Cf. e.g. Immerwahr 1966, 293; Flory 1987, 54–61 and 94; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 464; Lateiner 1989, 129–132.

[14] Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 464.

[15] Herodotus uses the expression οὐκ ἀτρεμίζειν (1. 185. 1; 1. 190. 2; 7. 8 α 1) as a variation on ἡσυχίην μὴ ἄγειν (7. 11. 2; 8. 108. 3; cf. 1. 66. 1 and compare ἡσυχάζειν in our text) when describing Persian imperialism; see Immerwahr 1966, 201 with n. 31.

Hybristic Cyrus

Of the "noble savages" who are threatened by Persian kings—Scythians, Massagetae, and Ethiopians—it is only in our case that the Persian campaign leads to an actual military engagement. Cambyses is forced to turn back because of the cannibalism practiced by his men (3. 25), while Darius' forces and the Scythians are lined up to do battle, but are interrupted by a hare who appears on the scene (4. 134). Cyrus, who does go to war, is defeated and killed and many commentators point out how Herodotus prepares his readers for the ruler's downfall. The Persian king is too prosperous, too successful in all his military endeavors[16] and it is, in part, Cyrus' elation[17] at his good fortune which leads him to attack the Massagetae. "Any Greek would recognize him as ripe for destruction."[18] The fact that it is a woman who serves as the Persian king's instrument of destruction makes his end, in Greek eyes, all the more appropriate.

Tomyris as wise adviser

ADM has Cyrus declare implacable war (ἄσπονδον πόλεμον)[19] against Tomyris, but according to Herodotus (1. 205. 2), the Persian king does not actually declare war; the queen understands his intentions when he begins building a bridge over the river Araxes. Tomyris then advises Cyrus. She suggests that he be satisfied with ruling his people and allow her to rule hers, warns him that he cannot know whether his campaign will turn out well, and then specifically proposes that Cyrus either cross over to her side of the river or else receive her on his territory. ADM twice uses the word "advised" (συνεβούλευε) to characterize Tomyris' messages to Cyrus and the queen does in fact serve as a "wise adviser" or "tragic warner" to the Persian king.[20]

---

[16] Cf. Lateiner 1982.

[17] ἐπαείροντα 1. 204. 2; compare Tomyris' warning μηδὲν ἐπαρθῇς 1. 212. 2 and see Avery 1979.

[18] Redfield 1985, 113.

[19] The expression ἄσπονδον πόλεμον "a war admitting of no truce", "an implacable war" found in our text is difficult: at this stage Cyrus' campaign is more of an open war (cf. ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανέος Hdt. 1. 205. 2), for the Persian king does not attempt to hide his expansionist aims. It is only the final, bitter, no-holds-barred encounter between Tomyris and Cyrus which can be termed implacable or ἄσπονδον.

[20] Cf. ὑποθήκῃσι τῇσίδε Hdt. 1. 206. 2; μευ εὖ παραινεούσης 1. 212. 3. Immerwahr 1966, 74–75 describes a three-part pattern of advice regularly found in Herodotus:

In the *History*, Cyrus is surprisingly silent after his initial offer of marriage, and in the course of his four exchanges with the Massagetan queen, Tomyris increasingly becomes the dominant figure. Thus after Cyrus proposes marriage (and is rejected) in *oratio obliqua.* (1. 205. 1), Tomyris addresses him directly, with the suggestion referred to here (1. 206. 1–3), but his reply to her is recorded in indirect speech (1. 208). In their third exchange, the Persian king does not bother to respond at all to Tomyris' proposal and threat; her words are again quoted by Herodotus in direct speech (1. 212). In the fourth and final "encounter" between the two, Cyrus is, of course, dead, but Tomyris addresses him passionately nonetheless (1. 214. 5). In our notice, Cyrus is made to seem more vocal and less quiescent than he is in Herodotus—cf. Κύρου καταγγείλαντος... ἀπειθοῦντος. Interestingly, modern scholars who discuss the Herodotean motif of the wise adviser do not include Tomyris among such counselors, perhaps because of the overwhelming presence in the *History* of another "wise adviser" who counsels Cyrus, Croesus.[21]

Croesus

Croesus does not, of course, appear in our notice, although a mere two words e.g. "as Croesus advised" (Κροίσου συμβουλεύσαντος) would have sufficed to indicate his part in the proceedings. In fact, none of the other ancient sources who tell of Tomyris mention the Lydian king, not even those sources which have fairly lengthy, detailed accounts, such as Justin. Even modern authors who summarize Herodotus' account of the encounter between Cyrus and Tomyris in some detail sometimes disregard the Lydian king.[22] Although Croesus is an important figure in Herodotus' *History* and his advice plays a pivotal role, he is, after all, sent off to safety before the final battle. There is, perhaps, a certain literary advantage in ignoring Croesus: we are better able to focus on the conflict between the two main figures in the episode, the Persian king and Massagetan queen. "These two are matched like heroes of the *Iliad*."[23]

---

comprehensive gnomic pronouncements, a general (usually negative) warning, and a specific, practical piece of advice or proposal and in Herodotus' account (1. 206), Tomyris' message to Cyrus at this juncture includes all three elements.

[21] See e.g. Lattimore 1939. Stahl 1975, 22 n. 24 compares Tomyris' role here to that of an oracle.

[22] See e.g. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 464–465.

[23] Gould 1989, 103.

In the *History*, Cyrus invades Massagetan territory as the result of advice given him by Croesus. After Tomyris offers him the choice between a battle on her territory or his, the Persian king convenes a council of Persian notables. All advise him to receive Tomyris' army on Persian soil, but Croesus recommends invading the land of the Massagetae (1. 206–207). The Lydian king backs up his advice with two arguments, one tactical and one psychological. Croesus' first contention is that Cyrus has nothing to gain by accepting the Massagetae on his home ground, only an empire to lose, for success will gain him nothing, while the Massagetae, if victorious, will not retreat, but push on to other Persian dominions. If, on the other hand, Cyrus wins the battle on Massagetan territory, he will then be able to go the heart of Tomyris' power. This argument by the Lydian king that—win or lose—Cyrus gains nothing by fighting the Massagetae on his home territory is remarkably similar to advice that Croesus himself had received when he set out to conquer the Persians (1. 71). The king is warned by his fellow Lydian Sandanis that there is no advantage to be had in defeating the impoverished Persians who are unacquainted with the good things in life, but the Persians, if victorious, will not be satisfied having once tasted Lydian luxuries. Croesus, of course, does not follow this advice and is defeated. The analogy between Croesus' attack on the Persians and Cyrus' present position is plain: Cyrus, Tomyris, the Persians, and the Massagetans of the present situation correspond respectively to Croesus, Cyrus, the Lydians, and the Persians of the earlier contest. Croesus tries to round out the situation by adding one further parallel: the Lydian king should correspond at this juncture to Sandanis before the Lydian-Persian war, for he tries to give wise advice to Cyrus in relation to the Massagetae. But Croesus has learned only a partial lesson from his own bitter experience. He should have applied Sandanis' argument to the situation analogous to his own in the past, i.e. to the very question of *whether* to attack. He would then have correctly concluded that Cyrus would realize no profit from warring on the primitive Massagetae. It is Tomyris who advises Cyrus not to go to war at all, so that our final parallel should actually be the correspondence between Tomyris and Sandanis: the Massagetan queen is the only wise figure in this story.[24] Croesus makes use of Sandanis' reasoning on a secondary issue, the problem of *where* to attack, and he applies the argument to only one of the two alternatives,

[24] Cf. Stahl 1975, 30.

i.e. a battle on Persian territory. Consequently, his advice proves wrong.[25]

Male pride

Croesus' second argument in favor of invading Massagetan territory turns upon male pride. It is unseemly and intolerable that Cyrus, son of Cambyses should give way and withdraw before a *woman* αἰσχρὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀνασχετὸν Κῦρόν γε τὸν Καμβύσεω γυναικὶ εἴξαντα ὑποχωρῆσαι τῆς χώρης (1. 207. 5). When Croesus refers here to Cyrus as the son of Cambyses, this may be an echo of the Persian king's own arrogant attitude: according to Herodotus, Cyrus' origin is one of the factors which leads the king to attack the Massagetae, for the unusual circumstances of his birth cause the Persian king to consider himself more than human (1. 204. 2). Another echo may be found in the expression "not to be tolerated" οὐκ ἀνασχετόν. Tomyris has said to Cyrus "accept (ἀνέχευ 1. 206. 1) the fact that I rule over my land," but Croesus warns him that the queen's sovereignty is not to be tolerated in any way. The Lydian's phrase εἴξαντα ὑποχωρῆσαι, where both words mean to yield or give way, stresses this point. That Croesus aids and abets Cyrus in his masculine pride is particularly striking when we remember that he has just warned the Persian king that he is only human, not immortal, and that human beings are vulnerable to the vicissitudes of fortune (1. 207. 2). If *mortals* must recognize the very precariousness of their existence, *men*, in Croesus' view, need not. One wonders what Herodotus means his readers to understand from the sharp distinction drawn by the Lydian between human beings and women. Is the historian showing us that Croesus is inconsistent and blind, or does he agree with the king's position and take it for granted? Stahl adduces the attitude of Sophocles' Creon towards Antigone as evidence that the humiliation of being bested by a woman was a "powerful" argument in Herodotus' time; we will encounter a similar stance in relation to Artemisia (below, p. 208).[26]

Croesus not only considers women inferior, he looks down upon the Massagetae because they are unused to wine. If Sandanis has

---

[25] For further analysis of Croesus' role here see Stahl 1975, esp. 9–10, 16, and 27–29; Flory 1987, 95–96; Redfield 1985, 113; Lattimore 1939, 29 with n. 12; Immerwahr 1966, 75 and 166; Shapiro 1994.

[26] Stahl 1975, 28.

warned Croesus that the Persians are not worth conquering because they drink water and not wine, the Lydian king does not realize that there is nothing to be gained by attacking the Massagetae, and he counsels Cyrus to take advantage of this ostensible weakness. Thus Croesus teaches Cyrus to look down upon his "inferiors", women and primitive people, and this is a poor lesson indeed.

Tomyris and the Ethiopian king

Let us return to Tomyris. Her proposal that Cyrus stop building a bridge and simply choose an arena for the battle seems to attest to her self-assurance and strength. She is unconcerned about Cyrus' invasion attempt and is willing to spare him the effort of constructing a bridge, just as she tries to save him the exertion of going to war altogether. At this stage of the proceedings, Tomyris is magnificently confident and treats the Persian king with condescension, perhaps even contempt. The Ethiopian king, another barbarian ruler in Herodotus who faces a Persian invasion (3. 20–22), has a similar attitude towards Cambyses, and there are many resemblances between the Massagetan queen and the Ethiopian king. Both rulers see through the duplicitous gifts or offers originally sent them by a Persian ruler; both warn the king to desist from his aggressive intentions; both use symbolic gestures as well as words; both prove tougher and wiser than their "civilized" opponents and, ultimately, both noble savages are victorious.[27] The Ethiopian king, who does not actually go to war with Cambyses, remains restrained and bemused throughout, while Tomyris will eventually dip Cyrus' head in a sack filled with blood. Gould sees this contrast between the two as "significant of what female power means to Herodotus."[28]

Wine

The difference between Tomyris and the Ethiopian king also expresses itself in relation to a much smaller issue, their attitude towards wine. Both these primitive rulers are unacquainted with the beverage, but when Cambyses presents the milk-drinking Ethiopians with some wine as a gift, the king likes this "ambivalent sign of

---

[27] Gould 1989, 102–105; Immerwahr 1966, 167 n. 53; Flory 1987, 97–98; cf. 81–118 for a more general discussion of noble savages in Herodotus.

[28] Gould 1989, 131.

civilization,"[29] and it is the only one of the Persian gifts which he does not reject as deceitful or useless (3. 22). Herodotus' Tomyris, on the other hand, speaks out vehemently against wine, which has been the downfall of her son. Struggling for words to describe the unfamiliar beverage,[30] she calls the fruit of the vine a drug (φάρμακον 1. 212. 2) which causes those who imbibe it to become mad and spew forth evil words.

This brings us to the second deception practiced by Cyrus in Herodotus' account, his use of wine: ADM avoids all mention of this crucial factor in the Persian's victory.[31] Cyrus, Herodotus tells us, adopts Croesus' plan and arranges for the weakest members of his army to fight the Massagetan forces.[32] He deliberately leaves an elaborate feast and great quantities of potent wine in the Persian camp for the Massagetan "victors", so that the barbarians, unused to Persian fare and unacquainted with wine, will become intoxicated and incapacitated. The Persian forces then return to their camp and kill some of the sleeping Massagetae; the rest, including Tomyris' son, are taken prisoner. Commentators trace this ruse of intoxicating primitive people who are unused to wine back to Odysseus and the Cyclops,[33] but the trick is often used against more sophisticated enemies as well.[34]

Deceptions

This is the second time Cyrus uses trickery in his dealings with Tomyris, after his initial attempt to gain control over the Massagetae by wooing the queen: neither ruse really succeeds and neither is mentioned by ADM.[35] Here, only one word—δόλῳ—need have been added to our notice in order to refer to Cyrus' trick and it is note-

---

[29] Flory 1987, 177 n. 22, cf. 91; see too Romm 1992, 57–58; Hartog 1988, 166–170.

[30] Cf. Flory 1987, 96.

[31] Cf. Tomyris' angry words to Cyrus in Herodotus δολώσας ἐκράτησας... ἀλλ' οὐ μάχῃ κατὰ τὸ καρτερόν (1. 212. 2; cf. 1. 214. 5).

[32] Hdt. 1. 211; cf. 1. 207. 6–7.

[33] Redfield 1985, 112; Romm 1992, 57; Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 968.

[34] Cf. e.g. Hdt. 2. 121 δ; Charon of Lampsacus (*FGrH* 262 F17); Nicolaus-Ctesias (*FGrH* 90 F66. 27–28). At Hdt. 1. 106 and Strabo 11. 8. 5, Scythians are the victims of this trick, while Polyaenus (8. 28) reverses the situation and has Tomyris deceive the Persians.

[35] See Saïd 1980–81, 92–93 and 97 on the alternation between trickery and force found throughout our story.

worthy that the ruse is omitted, for deception frequently figures both in Herodotus' military narratives and in the brief accounts of *DM.*[36] In almost all the other sources on Tomyris, deceit plays a part in the proceedings. Several writers not only mention Cyrus' trick but assign a counter-stratagem to Tomyris,[37] whereby simulating fright, she lures the Persian forces into a narrow pass and ambushes them. So too the queen's original suggestion that the Persian king cross over into her territory is described as a ploy: she will then be able to fight on her own territory and the river will block any attempt by her enemy to flee.[38] Cyrus also pretends to be afraid, in later sources: he does not allow part of his army to be killed as in Herodotus, but simply withdraws, ostensibly out of fear, leaving the food and wine behind. In other writers, it is only the Massagetan queen who is deceitful. Tomyris is said either to have ambushed the Persian forces or—in what seems to be an exact reversal of Herodotus' account—to have used food and wine to befuddle Cyrus' soldiers.[39]

When later sources assign Tomyris a counter-stratagem or cast her in the role of sole deceiver they are, in a sense, refashioning the queen's character and diminishing her. The Herodotean Tomyris is a proud, noble figure who would not stoop to deception and she is wiser, braver, and more moral than Cyrus. She is not the aggressor; she twice suggests being satisfied with what one has; she does not fight by guile or use tricks to gain the upper hand, but wins by sheer strength. Only at the very end is the queen bloodthirsty and vengeful. If we often think of deceit and wiles as womanly weapons used to counteract or circumvent powerful masculine violence,[40] in Herodotus it is Cyrus who uses trickery, while Tomyris prefers straightforward warfare: she is, by this criterion, the more masculine of the two. An important element of Herodotus' tale is the contrast between the queen's straightforward, primitive, "hard" ways and the devious, civilized, "soft" Cyrus.[41] Thus those later sources which complicate the plot of the Cyrus-Tomyris tale, having first one ruler and then the other simulate fright and lure the enemy into a trap,

---

[36] See above, p. 22 and below on Artemisia, p. 210.

[37] Cf. *pari insidiarum fraude* Justin 1. 8. 9; see Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 4 and cf. Strabo 11. 8. 5.

[38] Justin 1. 8. 2; Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 1—the latter is clearly based on the former.

[39] See Frontinus *Strat.* 2. 5. 5 and Sidonius *Carm.* 9. 35–37; Polyaenus 8. 28 reverses Herodotus' account.

[40] See Buxton 1994, 124 and above, p. 22.

[41] Redfield 1985, 109–113; Flory 1987, 88–90, 94–97.

do so at a cost: we are no longer confronted with two different ways of life and two different cultures. In these late sources, Tomyris is a plotting, maneuvering figure and not the noble savage of the *History*. When ADM omits the Persians' trick in his account, the effect is different, perhaps deliberately so. Cyrus is a more positive, less devious figure, for he seemingly wins a battle fair and square. Tomyris, on the other hand, is not presented as a justifiably indignant ruler, but simply as a bereaved mother bent on avenging the death of her son.

Tomyris' son

Indeed, Tomyris' son—his name in the *History* is Spargapises (Σπαργαπίσης 1. 211. 3)[42]—features prominently in our notice. He is mentioned four times in our brief account and the first parenthetical reference to him ἔχουσα καὶ υἱόν "she had a son" is unnecessary and unexpected, given the spare, unemotional summaries normally provided by ADM. This superfluous, somewhat pathetic phrase is indicative of the way our anonymous author sees Tomyris: the queen is, above all, a mother—an anguished, vengeful mother. In other sources we find different approaches to the Massagetan ruler. While in some later versions of her tale, Tomyris is again portrayed almost exclusively as a bereaved mother, in others she is both a mother and a queen who defends her country. A third group of writers depict Tomyris simply as the woman who defeated Cyrus and do not even mention her son.[43]

Cyrus captures Tomyris' son when he commands the Massagetan army in their first engagement with the Persians (Hdt. 1. 211. 3). He is not trapped in battle, but caught after he becomes intoxicated from the wine the Persians have deliberately left behind. If *DM* were our sole source, we would think that Spargapises killed himself because he was ashamed to have been captured, but the fuller version

---

[42] This is very like a Scythian name, Spargapithes (Σπαργαπείθης), found elsewhere in Herodotus (4. 76; cf. 78) and the name is thought to be of Iranian origin. See Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 973; Cook 1983, 37 and 235 n. 32.

[43] Bereaved mother—cf. *orbatae* . . . *Tomyris* Sidonius *Carm.* 9. 37; *ultrix acerrima filiorum* [sic!] Ammianus Marcellinus 23. 6. 7. Mother and queen: cf. *vel matris vel reginae* Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 4; compare Valerius Maximus 9. 10 ext. 1 and Justin 1. 8. 9. Defeats Cyrus: Theon *Progym.* 9; Lucian *Charon* 13; Polyaenus 8. 28; Frontinus *Strat.* 2. 5. 5.

found in the *History*, telling of his drunkenness, makes his suicide easier to understand. Herodotus tells us that after Spargapises became sober and understood his situation (ἔμαθε ἵνα ἦν κακοῦ 1. 213), he asked to be released from his bonds. Cyrus granted his request and as soon as the Massagetan prince had the use of his hands, he killed himself. Why does Cyrus release him from his bonds? Does he suspect what young Spargapises intends to do? In other sources,[44] Tomyris' son does not take his own life, but is killed by the Persian king and perhaps even in the Halicarnassian's account we are meant to think that Cyrus is partially responsible for the youngster's death.

Herodotus does not tell us how old Spargapises is, but his behavior—his intoxication and subsequent suicide—seems to be that of a young and inexperienced man, and indeed in later writers he is termed an *adulescentulum filium.*[45] Nonetheless, Tomyris' son is old enough to lead the Massagetan army in their encounter with the Persians and one wonders why he does not rule the Massagetae instead of his mother. A similar question arises in relation to Artemisia, who has a son mature enough to go to war, but rules Halicarnassus herself and joins Xerxes on his military campaign (below, p. 206). Tomyris, unlike Artemisia, does not go to war at first, and it is only after her son kills himself and a third of her army has been destroyed, i.e. only after the situation has becomes critical, that she takes to the battlefield.

Sparethra

In many ways, Tomyris' situation is similar to that of another queen who does battle with Cyrus, the Sacian Sparethra, who is found in Ctesias' *Persica.*[46] Photius' brief summary of the later books of the *Persica* is our source for the story of Sparethra, the wife of the Sacian king Amorges (*FGrH* 688 F9. 3). Cyrus wages war on the Sacians and captures Amorges, but Sparethra organizes a huge army of men and women and defeats Cyrus. She captures Cyrus' brother-in-law and his children and later exchanges them in return for her husband. Subsequently, Amorges is Cyrus' ally in his war against Croesus, and on his deathbed Cyrus has his sons pledge to continue

---

[44] Valerius Maximus 9. 10 ext. 1; Justin 1. 8. 8; cf. Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 3.

[45] Justin 1. 8. 5; Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 2.

[46] See above on Zarinaea (p. 89 and 94) for more on Sparethra.

the alliance. While Sparethra defeats Cyrus, her victory is followed by reconciliation, not the vengeful execution of the Persian king, for Cyrus and her husband Amorges become the best of friends. The two tales of Tomyris and Sparethra may have such dissimilar conclusions because of the different fates of the hostages taken by Cyrus during the first battle: Amorges, Sparethra's husband, survives while Tomyris' son kills himself in captivity.[47] Sparethra, a successful warrior queen, who manages both to defeat Cyrus and rescue her husband would have been an excellent candidate for inclusion in *DM*, particularly in view of the fact that her tale is told by Ctesias, an author already cited by ADM. Perhaps Sparethra is not included in our collection because she is too similar to Tomyris; *two* Sacian-type queens who defeated Cyrus would have been too much.[48] And it may well be that Sparethra is too fortunate a figure, for she is happily married: all of the women of *DM* are either widowed or unattached.

Warfare and children

Tomyris and Sparethra do not participate in the initial battle against Cyrus: each goes to war only when her country's forces are defeated and a close member of her family—a son or a husband—is taken hostage. In ancient sources we find that even for warrior women, warfare and children or family life do not always mix: at times there is a clear demarcation between the two spheres of war and marriage (or family).[49] Thus, in one of his two accounts of Amazons (3. 53), Diodorus Siculus states that the Amazons of Libya remained virgins while doing their war service, but withdrew from the battlefield once it was time for them to procreate. Hippocrates (*Airs, Waters, Places* 17) tells us that Sauromatae women must kill 3 men before they can marry, but they rarely go to war after marriage unless there is some general, urgent campaign ἕως ἂν μὴ ἀνάγκη καταλάβῃ παγκοίνου στρατείης. This is of course precisely the kind of battle both Tomyris and Sparethra take part in. The Sauromatae are akin to the Scythians, so that perhaps it is not a coincidence that the Scythian

[47] Cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985, 466.

[48] The first century AD rhetorician Theon closely links the two queens, Tomyris and Sparethra, and in a discussion of women who were braver than men, mentions them both as being more courageous than Cyrus (*Progym.* 9); see introduction, p. 58.

[49] Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 979–985 and 998–1003; Hartog 1988, 216–224.

Sparethra and the Scythian-like Tomyris behave just as the married women of the Sauromatae do, staying away from the battlefield except in cases of dire emergency. According to Herodotus (4. 110–117), the Sauromatae women—who in his account are part Amazon, part Scythian—are not allowed to wed until they have killed one enemy; they continue to go to war, it seems, even after they are married.[50]

The thirst for blood

Mother though she may be, Tomyris does not react to her son's death in strictly womanly fashion; as Justin notes, she soothes her feelings by a quest for blood, not with tears.[51] In Herodotus, Tomyris calls Cyrus insatiable of blood, and swearing an oath by the god of the Massagetae, the sun, she promises to give him his fill of blood if he does not desist and release her son: ἄπληστε αἵματος Κῦρε . . . σε ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπληστον ἐόντα αἵματος κορέσω (1. 212. 2–3). Tomyris also protests against the Persian king's use of trickery, and has harsh words to say about his "drug", wine. If earlier the queen has seemed sensible and cool, almost unperturbed by Cyrus' campaign, here, while she again counsels moderation—advising the Persian king not to be emboldened by his success and to be content with what he has achieved thus far—her wisdom is combined with a powerful threat. In Herodotus, the Massagetan queen changes before our eyes from detached adviser to vengeful enemy. ADM simply uses the word συνεβούλευε "advised" to characterize both her messages and he includes only the gist of her communication, with no hint of the force and authority that the queen now commands: Tomyris' dark, emotional, and dramatic tone is lost in our anonymous author's bland summary. Nor does ADM mention what a furious battle the second encounter between the Persians and Massagetans was: Herodotus describes it as the fiercest battle between barbarians known to him. The combatants first fought at a distance, using bows and arrows, and then wielded spears and daggers at close quarters.[52] Justin mentions a figure of 200,000 Persians killed and says that not a single

[50] See on Zarinaea, p. 94.

[51] Justin 1. 8. 9; cf. Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 4.

[52] Hdt. 1. 214. 1–2; Immerwahr 1966, 244 contends that Herodotus knew nothing specific of this "presumably legendary" battle.

messenger survived to tell the tale, leaving us to wonder about his source(s) for the story.[53]

In Herodotus, Tomyris supervises the defeat and death of the Persian king, even if she does not do the actual killing herself and has to search for Cyrus' body. Other sources speak in a general way of the queen slaughtering or destroying the Persian forces with Cyrus among them,[54] while Lucian (*Charon* 13) specifically says that Cyrus was killed by Tomyris. Diodorus' Scythian queen (2. 44. 2) also seems directly responsible for the capture and crucifixion of the Persian king. In the *History*, Tomyris' maltreatment of Cyrus' corpse consists of dipping his head in a wineskin filled with blood; she may well have been the one to sever his head from his body. Her intention is not to torture the Persian ruler who is already dead, but literally to give him his fill of blood, just as she has threatened earlier. Commentators point out the link in the Massagetan queen's eyes between drinking wine and drinking blood, and note the Scythian practice described by Herodotus (4. 64–66) of drinking the blood of one's enemies and using their skulls as wine cups.[55] Herodotus's tale of Phanes, the Greek mercenary who defected from Amasis to Cambyses, is an interesting parallel. He escapes his guards by intoxicating them; subsequently angry Greek mercenaries will drink the blood of his children, mixed with water and wine (3. 4, 11).

Tomyris accompanies her symbolic act with angry words, addressing the Persian king for one last time. In this final address to Cyrus, Tomyris no longer offers sage counsel or couples a warning with advice, as she has done earlier. Instead she pours words of scorn on the dead Persian king, condemning his treachery and alluding to her promise to give him his fill of blood: σὺ μὲν ἐμὲ ζῶσάν τε καὶ νικῶσάν σε μάχῃ ἀπώλεσας παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν ἑλὼν δόλῳ· σὲ δ' ἐγώ, κατά περ ἠπείλησα, αἵματος κορέσω (1. 214. 5). This statement by the Herodotean queen left its mark on other writers and the opening of Stryangaeus' letter to Zarinaea in Ctesias is, for instance, quite similar.[56] Valerius Maximus, in his very brief account of the queen's

[53] Justin 1. 8. 11–12; cf. Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 5; Sidonius *Carm.* 9. 35; Ammianus 23. 6. 7.

[54] Justin 1. 8. 11; Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 5; Polyaenus 8. 28; Ammianus 23. 6. 7; Ampelius *Liber Mem.* 13. 1; cf. Frontinus *Strat.* 2. 5. 5.

[55] Hartog 1988, 162–171 esp. 167; Benardete 1969, 116–117; Rossellini and Saïd 1978, 969; Cook 1983, 37; cf. Immerwahr 1966, 166–167.

[56] Gray 1989, 5; see above, p. 97.

revenge, notes that Tomyris criticizes Cyrus' insatiable thirst for blood (*insatiabilem cruoris sitim* 9. 10. ext. 1), and Justin and his imitator Orosius have her reproach the dead king in similar fashion, weaving together two of the queen's statements in Herodotus.[57] Late authors found Tomyris' final, simultaneous action of drowning Cyrus in blood even more impressive than her hissing words and there are several references to Tomyris' bag filled with blood, even in very brief accounts of the Massagetan queen.[58] If Herodotus portrays the Massagetan queen as a noble savage, in this final scene we are struck by her savagery rather than her nobility.[59] ADM mentions neither the wineskin nor the queen's words, draining the color and passion from Herodotus's powerful scene.

The historical background

What of the historical background to our tale? Babylonian sources indicate that Cyrus died in 530 BC.[60] While there are several different accounts of the manner of Cyrus' death, most ancient sources agree in having Cyrus die while on a military campaign in the northeastern or eastern borders of his empire.[61] A fortress built by Cyrus near the Jaxartes (= Araxes) river, which survived down to the time of Alexander the Great, indicates that the Persian king was active on this frontier near the Massagetae.[62] The available evidence does not allow us to establish whether Herodotus' account of the death of Cyrus is correct. Herodotus states that he chose this version as the most plausible of the several accounts known to him (1. 214), but the story is not without difficulties. The defeated Persian forces would have had to recover Cyrus' mutilated body and transport it back to Pasargadae. As for Tomyris herself, it is impossible to confirm or disprove her existence.[63]

---

[57] Hdt. 1. 212. 2–3 and 1. 214. 5. See Justin 1. 8. 13; Orosius *Hist.* 2. 7. 6; cf. Ambrosius *ep.* 18. 36 and see Ziegler 1937, 1703.

[58] See the accounts of Valerius Maximus, Lucian, Justin, Sidonius, and Orosius.

[59] Cf. Dewald 1981, 109–110; Gould 1989, 131. Redfield 1985, 112–113 links Tomyris' use of the word κορέσω here with the notorious Greek triad of κόρος, ὕβρις, ἄτη.

[60] Kuhrt 1988, 127–128; Parker and Dubberstein 1956, 14.

[61] See e.g. Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F9. 7–8; Diodorus 2. 44. 2; Berossus *FGrH* 680 F10; contrast Onesicritus *FGrH* 134 F36; Xen. *Cyr.* 8. 7. 2 ff.; cf. Weissbach 1924, 1156–1157.

[62] Cook 1983, 36–38.

[63] Asheri 1988, 383 (ad Hdt. 1. 205. 2).

ADM as epitomator

There is little doubt that ADM follows Herodotus' text closely in our notice. Thus, for instance, when the Tomyris of *DM* advises Cyrus to stay peaceably in his own territory (ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις μένοντι ἡσυχάζειν), she combines the Herodotean queen's behest to the Persian king to stop his invasion and rule his own people with her observation that Cyrus would prefer anything to living quietly (δι' ἡσυχίης εἶναι 1. 206. 1–2). One phrase of our notice εἰ δ' ἄρα ἐπιθυμοίη πολεμεῖν is particularly noteworthy.[64] It contains the only optative found in the entire text of *DM* and the only use of ἄρα and is one of the two instances of indirect speech in our text. There is no direct speech in *DM*.

Since we have both the original source of the *DM* notice, Herodotus, and a wide variety of other accounts telling of Tomyris, some of which are equally condensed, we are in a particularly good position to judge the epitome furnished here by ADM. It is illuminating to compare our notice to a similarly brief description of Cyrus' death at the hands of Tomyris, found in Lucian (*Charon* 13). Lucian has an eye for the vivid, picturesque detail. His Massagetan queen rides a white horse; as in Herodotus, she cuts off Cyrus' head and dips it in a skin filled with blood. Other authors, such as Valerius Maximus and Sidonius, have very curtailed accounts, but manage to find room for Tomyris' bag; our excerptor, ADM, is not drawn to this striking item. Later sources (e.g. Justin and his imitator Orosius) also use colorful, pathetic language to describe the queen, speaking of her bereavement and manly courage. ADM eschews these rhetorical effects—except for his repeated mention of Tomyris' son—and his presentation here, as elsewhere in *DM*, is straightforward and unadorned. Our anonymous author omits many significant details found in Herodotus: Cyrus' marriage proposal, the wine ruse (and Tomyris' subsequent anger at the deception), the role played by Croesus, and the Massagetan queen's final vengeful words and deed. It is not only the plot complications that are lost in our summary: the moral implications and the very feel of Herodotus' tale have disappeared as well. ADM presents Tomyris chiefly as a bereaved, vengeful mother, but the noble, vigorous, and wise Massagetan queen has more depth than that.

---

[64] Cf. Hdt. 1. 206. 2 εἰ μεγάλως προθυμέαι Μασσαγετέων πειρηθῆναι.

Artemisia

Source: Herodotus 7. 99; 8. 68, 87–88, 93, 101–102.
Related Sources: Polyaenus 8. 53. 1–3, 5; Pausanias 3. 11. 3; Justin 2. 12. 23; Harpocration s.v. Ἀρτεμισία; Suda s.v. Ἀρτεμισία and s.v. Ἡρόδοτος; Plutarch *Moralia* 869f–870a (*De Herodoti Malignitate* 38); Plutarch *Themistocles* 14. 3; [Hippocrates] *Epistulae* 27. 5; Ptolemy Hephaestion in: Photius codex 190, 153a; Aristoph. *Lysistrata* 675 + Σ; *Thesmophoriazusae* 1200; Aristodemus *FGrH* 104 F1. 1.

Artemisia, the ruler of Halicarnassus who joined Xerxes' expedition against Greece, is a contradictory character in Herodotus' *History*, ADM's source for this notice. No sooner do we assign her a quality than we must qualify it: she is a woman, but the only "man" in Xerxes' forces; she is a Greek on the side of the barbarians, but actually is neither wholly Greek nor wholly on the side of the barbarians; she is courageous and yet cowardly; and she is loyal to no one.[1]

The historical background

Artemisia ruled in Halicarnassus of Caria at the beginning of the fifth century. Her influence extended to Cos, Nisyrus, and Calydna as well, in what has been described as "a kind of sub-satrapy."[2] The firmest date for her is 480, the year of her participation in the battle of Salamis. Her grandson, the tyrant Lygdamis (named after the queen's father), was Herodotus' contemporary and the cause of the historian's flight from Halicarnassus, according to the Suda.[3]

Artemisia's family

How Greek was Artemisia? Herodotus tells us that she comes from mixed parentage: her father Lygdamis was from Halicarnassus, while her mother was Cretan (7. 99. 2). Lygdamis himself may well have been Carian rather than Greek, and Artemisia's brother Pigres, the would-be poet who is said to have rewritten Homer in elegiac form,

---

[1] See Weil 1976 and below, p. 210.
[2] Hart 1982, 160.
[3] Suda s.v. Ἡρόδοτος. Lygdamis may actually have been her nephew or son—see Meiggs and Lewis 1969, 72.

has a Carian name.[4] Halicarnassus was a city caught between various cultures, Greek and Carian, Ionian and Doric, and Artemisia, with her mixed parentage and set of paradoxical qualities is a fitting ruler of the area.[5]

Herodotus tells us that Artemisia took over the tyranny after her husband died (7. 99. 1), so that rule in Halicarnassus certainly cannot be considered matriarchal or even matrilinear, even though Artemisia is half-Cretan and in Crete "many matriarchal survivals have been noticed."[6] The historian does not mention the name of Artemisia's husband and there is no trace of him elsewhere. Even his grandson, Lygdamis, is not given his name, but that of his wife's father. Artemisia's spouse is, then, one of the anonymous background husbands of *DM* whose main function seems to be to ensure that his widow becomes ruler.

Young sons

Artemisia's tale begins when she joins the Persian king's campaign against Greece.[7] She joins the expedition of her own free will, because of her courage and bold spirit (διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνδρείαν). The word ἀνδρεία is of course a paradoxical one to use of a woman[8] and even in *DM*, a collection devoted to warrior women, it appears only two more times (in relation to Atossa and Rhodogyne). Herodotus emphasizes that there was no necessity (cf. οὐδεμιῆς οἱ ἐούσης ἀναγκαίης 7. 99. 1) for Artemisia to join Xerxes. Some commentators interpret the word necessity to mean political coercion: Artemisia, like the Greeks and unlike the Persians' slavish allies (cf. 7. 96), had a political choice and elected to join Xerxes of her own free will.[9] But it is more likely that the historian means that Artemisia, a woman, could well have stayed at home. He tells us, in fact, that she is the

[4] See Hornblower 1982, 10 n. 49 and 30–31 n. 194.

[5] Gould 1989, 5–8; Hart 1982, 159–160; Hornblower 1982, 4–31.

[6] Hornblower 1982, 359.

[7] The wording in *DM* ἐπεστράτευσε τῷ Πέρσῃ is unusual; normally ἐπεστράτευσε would mean that she fought against—not with—the Persian king. See e.g. Zarinaea (c. 2): τοῦ δὲ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἐπιστρατεύσαντος πολεμοῦσα. For ἐπί as fighting *with* rather than *against* see ἐπιβοηθέω which is used in Thuc. 3. 26 as "send an expedition against" but elsewhere (e.g. Thuc. 1. 73, 4. 29 etc.) as "send to the aid of"; cf. too ἐπιμαχέω which means help one another in battle (Thuc. 5. 27).

[8] Cf. Munson 1988, 92 n. 5.

[9] Munson 1988, 95; Benardete 1969, 192–193.

mother of a young son, and this son apparently was old enough to go to war.[10]

There are several other women in *DM* who have such young sons and the relationships of these mothers with their children varies. Lyde does not sit on the throne herself, but tries to educate her child to rule wisely. Tomyris first has her son go to war with Cyrus and only later, after he is killed, appears on the battlefield herself. Artemisia resembles Semiramis, for it seems that neither is willing to relinquish control and hand over the reins of power to her son. These young men must wait for their mothers to die in order to inherit their father's throne and Ninyas, as we have seen, grows impatient and conspires against Semiramis.

Artemisia's advice

ADM tells us that Xerxes admires Artemisia both for her actions and her good sense and in Herodotus we twice see her advising the Persian ruler.[11] Artemisia's first piece of good advice is her recommendation to Xerxes to avoid attacking by sea at Salamis and to advance to the Peloponnese (8. 68). Here the queen plays the role of a tragic warner, in addition to offering practical advice.[12] Her predictions on the consequences of a naval battle are so accurate that, as Plutarch mockingly points out, all that is missing is for Herodotus to put Artemisia's words into verse and turn her into a Sibyl.[13] Xerxes admires Artemisia's counsel, but does not, of course, heed her. On the second occasion, after the disaster at Salamis, Artemisia advises Xerxes to withdraw from Greece and leave Mardonius behind to try to subdue the Greeks (Hdt. 8. 101–103). This time Xerxes does listen to Artemisia, but Herodotus ironically adds that the Persian ruler would have withdrawn even if every man—and woman—had advised against it: οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ πάντες καὶ πᾶσαι συνεβούλευον μένειν, ἔμενε ἂν δοκέειν ἐμοί (8. 103). When offering counsel, Artemisia displays not only good sense, but courage, for unlike Xerxes' other allies, she is not afraid to voice her true opinions to the Persian king (8. 69) and she does not hesitate to advise against military action.

[10] See How and Wells 1912 ii, 164 (ad Hdt. 7. 99. 1) and Hart 1982, 160 vs. Meiggs and Lewis 1969, 72.
[11] Hdt. 7. 99. 3 and 8. 69. 2; cf. 8. 101. 4.
[12] Lattimore 1939, 29; Immerwahr 1966, 278.
[13] Plut. *Mor.* 869f–870a.

The queen at war

Turning to Artemisia's deeds, we find that she claims to have fought well at Euboea: οὔτε κακίστη γενομένη . . . οὔτε ἐλάχιστα ἀποδεξαμένη (8. 68. α1), but Herodotus does not actually mention her in his running description of the battle. At Salamis, on the other hand, he provides a detailed account of her doings (8. 87–88). Artemisia's vessel is rammed by a Greek ship. We are subsequently told (8. 93. 1) that Artemisia's pursuer is Ameinias, one of the heroes of Salamis; according to the Athenians he initiated the naval battle. (In later sources, from Diodorus onwards, Ameinias is said to be the brother of the tragedian Aeschylus.)[14] Artemisia immediately turns upon her closest neighbor, her ally, king Damasithymus of Calynda, and rams him. The Greek captain seeing Artemisia attack a Persian ship then turns away, while the Calyndian ship sinks: no one aboard survives to tell the tale. Herodotus states that he does not know whether Artemisia deliberately chose Damasithymus as a victim, but some commentators think that the king stood in her way in more ways than one.[15] Artemisia's good fortune extends even further: a Persian observer seeing her sink what he thinks is a Greek vessel comments on her daring deed to Xerxes, who then utters his famous words on his women becoming men and his men, women. Our notice, incidentally, provides a rare instance of ADM adding a little color to his original text, for Herodotus has the king utter these words (εἰπεῖν λέγεται . . . 8. 88. 3), while in *DM* Xerxes *shouts* (ἀνέκραγεν) his men-women statement.[16]

Men and women: a reversal of roles

Xerxes' memorable exclamation is quoted—in one variation or another—by several of the sources on Artemisia.[17] The tale of Artemisia's prowess is not coupled with any description of cowardice on the part of the Persians at Salamis (unlike their earlier performance at Thermopylae)[18] and one wonders what lies behind the second half of Xerxes' statement. Does the fact that a woman displays skill in battle

[14] See Frost 1980, 156.
[15] Cf. Burn 1984, 466.
[16] Cf. Polyaenus 8. 53. 5 where Xerxes shouts as well.
[17] Polyaenus 8. 53. 5; Suda s.v. Ἀρτεμισία; Aristodemus *FGrH* 104 F1. 1 all quote or paraphrase; cf. Σ *ad* Aristoph. *Lys.* 675 καὶ ἱκανῶς ἠνδραγάθησεν; Justin 2. 12. 23 *virilem audaciam*.
[18] Cf. Munson 1988, 102.

somehow make the men fighting at her side less virile? Polyaenus (8. 53. 5), for example, not only has Xerxes see Artemisia fighting well but his men fighting badly. The Athenians certainly thought it terrible that a *woman* was doing battle with them and Herodotus tells us that a special reward was offered for the queen's capture (Hdt. 8. 93. 2). Had her pursuer Ameinias known that he was attacking Artemisia's vessel, the author of the *History* adds, he would not have stopped until either he or she was captured.[19] While the Greeks cannot bear the thought of women attacking them, they do not seem to mind having a woman who urges them on to fight. Herodotus tells of a female apparition φάσμα . . . γυναικός at Salamis who reprimands the Greek forces for holding back. She speaks so loudly that the entire army hears her (8. 84. 2).

Xerxes' men-women remark has several echoes in the *History*.[20] Herodotus himself has said earlier that the Greeks by their courageous fighting make it clear to everyone, including Xerxes, that the Persian king has many men in his army, but few brave ones (πολλοὶ μὲν ἄνθρωποι . . . ὀλίγοι δὲ ἄνδρες 7. 210). Artemisia, too, has earlier compared men and women, warning Xerxes before Salamis that the Greeks are as superior to the Persians on the sea as men are to women (8. 68 a 1).[21] This seems an odd statement for the queen to make, in view of her own maritime and martial skills, and Artemisia will subsequently prove superior to both Greek and barbarian men at sea, fooling Ameinias and drowning her neighbor. Xerxes' words about his men are, of course, scathing: normally Persians cannot bear being called more cowardly than women. We are told for instance that when Masistes reprimands Artyantes harshly for his poor generalship, saying among other things that he is γυναικὸς κακίω, Artyantes tries to kill him (9. 107). Elsewhere (9. 20) the Persian cavalry, when attacking the Greeks, call *them* women.

Bravery and deceit

Artemisia, then, is exceptionally lucky, for her immoral act not only saves her life, but wins her further praise from the Persian king. The

---

19 Compare Croesus' feelings about Cyrus receiving Tomyris, a woman, on his own territory (above, p. 194).

20 Dewald 1981, 114 n. 2; Immerwahr 1966, 187 with n. 114.

21 See Immerwahr 1966, 255–256 and above (p. 110) on the land-sea contrast in Herodotus.

Halicarnassian queen displays great presence of mind and courage of a sort, but her bravery is neither straightforward nor conventional; Artemisia represents the triumph of luck, cunning, and deception.[22] Above all the queen is a paradoxical figure: a woman who fights men, a Greek on the side of the barbarians, and a courageous coward who deceives both friend and foe. Her tale is one of inverted values, of a topsy-turvy world, as Weil points out so well.[23] Saïd has a discussion of another military hero in Herodotus, Zopyrus, who has a similar assortment of contradictory qualities (Hdt. 3. 153–160). She argues that the historian's chief interest is in Zopyrus' paradoxical situation, in the contradiction between appearances and reality, rather than his military maneuvers, and this is true of Artemisia as well.[24]

In *DM* we find no trace of Artemisia's complex, contradictory qualities and she is presented as the quintessential warrior women, Aristophanes' Amazon at sea (cf. *Lys.* 675). ADM's one-dimensional portrait of Artemisia may be due simply to the curt, summary format of our notices. Other ancient sources refer to Artemisia's bravery without mentioning the queen's duplicity[25] and even modern scholars present us at times with a condensed account of a courageous queen.[26] But such a succinct, smooth summary is distortion of a sort: while one could argue that Artemisia's quick thinking is an important component of her courage, there is a world of difference between straightforward bravery and the Halicarnassian ruler's deed. The brevity of the notices in *DM* is not really an excuse. By simply adding a few words (e.g. "mistakenly admiring her duplicitous deeds, Xerxes exclaimed . . ."), ADM could have presented Herodotus' tricky Artemisia. In the *History* deception or trickery is a recurring motif in military accounts[27] and deception is nearly as prominent a characteristic of the women in *DM* as their going to war, so that it is surprising to find Artemisia's chicanery omitted here.

Who was Herodotus's source here, if none of the crew of the sunken ship survived to tell the tale? Did Artemisia spread the story, mock-

---

[22] Lateiner 1990, 232; Munson 1988, 102–103.

[23] Weil 1976; cf. Tourraix 1990.

[24] Saïd 1980–81, 100–101.

[25] Aristoph. *Lys.* 675 + Σ; Pausanias 3. 11. 3; Polyaenus 8. 53. 5; Justin 2. 12. 23; Suda s.v. Ἀρτεμισία. Contrast Polyaenus 8. 53. 1–3 and Aristodemus *FGrH* 104 F1. 1 who *do* mention her deception.

[26] Cf. e.g. Lateiner 1989, 140; Hornblower 1987, 14; Podlecki 1975, 259.

[27] Immerwahr 1966, 243–4; cf. Saïd 1980–81, 92–102; Lateiner 1990, 231–4.

ing Xerxes? Did she prefer to be thought clever and lucky, rather than brave? Perhaps the story is meant to show that the Halicarnassians, although Persian subjects, were, in fact, loyal Greeks and actually fought against the Persians at Salamis.

Inaccuracies in DM

The final section of our notice, according to which Xerxes presents Artemisia with a suit of armor, and the Phoenician commanders with distaffs and spindles, does *not* appear in Herodotus. This is surprising, for the first half of the notice is an accurate and fairly close paraphrase of the historian's original text. The story of Artemisia is relatively long and scattered over several sections of the *History*, so that an epitomator who wished to summarize Herodotus's portrayal of the queen, needed to invest time and effort and read several distinct passages. In the first part of our notice, ADM appears to have done precisely that, and some of the details provided are near quotations from different sections of Herodotus' text.[28] Thus we are told of the places under Artemisia's rule (ἄρχουσα Ἁλικαρνασσέων, Κώων, Νισυρίων *DM*; ἡγεμόνευε δὲ Ἁλικαρνησσέων τε καὶ Κῴων καὶ Νισυρίων τε καὶ Καλυδνίων Hdt. 7. 99. 2),[29] of the queen's decision to go off to war (διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνδρείαν ἐπεστράστευσε *DM*; ὑπὸ λήματός τε καὶ ἀνδρηίης ἐστρατεύετο Hdt. 7. 99. 1) and Xerxes' men-women statement (ὡς αἱ γυναῖκες μὲν αὐτῷ ἄνδρες, οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες γυναῖκες αὐτῷ γεγόνασιν *DM*; οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες Hdt. 8. 88. 3). These close paraphrases, which are based on two different sections of the *History* would seem to indicate that ADM consulted Herodotus firsthand. Nonetheless, our account also includes details which are not found in Herodotus and the fact that our anonymous author interpolates material which was not found in his original source has important implications for the work as a whole. Our notice demonstrates that ADM does not always summarize his alleged source accurately: he cannot be trusted. In the case of Herodotus, we are well able to check the original work, but when

[28] It is worth noting that ADM does not generally preserve Herodotus' Ionic forms in our notice, but cf. Λυγδάμιος.

[29] The omission of Herodotus' last item, the Dorian island of Calydna (Κάλυδνα), later Calymnos (Κάλυμνα) may be due to its confusion with the Carian town of Calynda (Κάλυνδα) home of king Damasithymus, whose ship Artemisia sank. How and Wells 1912 ii, 265 (ad 8. 87. 3) fall prey to this confusion; cf. Hart 1982, 205 n. 10.

DM is our sole authority for certain details supposedly found in a lost, fragmentary author, we must be wary.

Spindles and armor: symbolic gifts

The additional information found in our account of Artemisia seems Herodotean, even though it is not taken from the *History*, for it is very much in the spirit of the work. The presentation of gifts described in our notice would certainly not be out of place in the *History*. Persian kings were known for their πολυδωρία, their generous gift-giving, and Herodotus' Xerxes has a penchant for bestowing presents. Pythius receives a vast fortune from Xerxes (Hdt. 7. 27–28), a Phoenician ship captain is given a gold crown by the Persian king (8. 118) and Xerxes' mistress Artyante receives the robe of many colors that she requests (9. 109). (Interestingly, all three of these beneficiaries of the king's largesse will undergo great hardship almost immediately afterwards.) The pair of antithetical, but complementary gifts which Xerxes gives here—armor to a woman, spindles and distaffs to the men—only emphasize the reversal of gender roles Artemisia and the Phoenicians seem to have displayed during the sea battle and thus amplify Xerxes' men-women statement in Herodotus.[30] Just as Xerxes' compliment to Artemisia is coupled with a scornful condemnation of his men, the very masculine reward awarded to the queen is linked with the presentation of demeaning, womanly gifts to the Phoenicians.

In the *History* there are several instances of symbolic gifts, such as the Scythians' gifts to Darius, the Ethiopian king's present of a long bow to Cambyses, the gold chains given to Democedes by Darius, and, of course, Euethlon's gift of a spindle and distaff to Pheretime.[31] This last gift is presented in a context very similar to our own, as the ultimate present for a female. When Pheretime repeatedly asks Euelthon of Salamis for an army in order to return her son to power in Cyrene, she receives from him all sorts of other gifts instead. Euelthon finally sends her a golden spindle and distaff with wool on it, explaining that these are presents appropriate for a woman, not an army (τοιούτοισι γυναῖκας δωρέεσθαι ἀλλ' οὐ στρατιῇ 4. 162. 5).

[30] Cf. Melber 1885, 482.

[31] Hdt. 4. 131–2; 3. 21–22; 3. 130 (and cf. 3. 22. 2; 3. 23. 4); 4. 162. See too S. West 1988.

This womanly gift sent to the warlike Pheretime in order to put her in her place (above, p. 168) is very likely to have been the inspiration for the story found in *DM*—whatever the intermediate source—of the spindles and distaffs sent to the cowardly Phoenician commanders. One can see how Xerxes' men-women statement in Herodotus, coupled with the Persian king's reputation for πολυδωρία and the gift given to Pheretime, could lead precisely to such a tale. It is perhaps less humiliating for Pheretime, a woman, to receive such a present, and the fact that Pheretime's spindle and distaff were of gold may have taken some of the sting out of the gift: we are reminded of the golden spinning equipment used by Helen in Homer.[32] Here, the male Phoenicians are given the clear and contemptuous message that they might as well stay home and work wool with the women.

The symbolic gifts in Herodotus do not speak for themselves and are generally accompanied by an explanation of their meaning, just as we find here in *DM.* (Polyaenus 8. 53. 2 also tells of Xerxes' significant gifts to Artemisia and the commander of his fleet, but includes no such explanation; it is understood what the presents mean.) Gould notes that symbolic gifts in Herodotus serve as a warning of some kind, "a figurative statement of limitation",[33] but this is less true of Xerxes' presents here, for they confirm the roles already assumed by Artemisia and the Phoenicians.

Men's gifts and women's gifts

In Polyaenus (53. 2) we are told that the panoply is given to Artemisia as an ἀριστεῖον—cf. too 53. 5 where Artemisia is given τὰ ἀριστεῖα by Xerxes—and indeed a full suit of armor was a regular prize for bravery.[34] A reward for valor such as we find here is another feature which *seems* Herodotean, for more than any other Greek author, Herodotus is careful to record the awarding of aristeia after various battles.[35] Usually the historian notes the aristeia presented by the Greeks, but he also mentions rewards for bravery awarded by Xerxes (8. 10, 17, 85). The author of the *History* tells us that during the battle of Salamis, the Persian king has royal scribes write down

---

[32] Cf. Barber 1994, 207–214, 226–231.
[33] Gould 1989, 57; cf. Flory 1987, 90.
[34] Pritchett 1974, 290.
[35] Pritchett 1974, 283–288.

the names of those who fought courageously (8. 90); presumably these men will later be rewarded. The gift of armor is meant to underline the queen's courage during battle, unusual in a woman, but perhaps it is not surprising that the Persian king is said to give Artemisia a military gift. Herodotus tells us that Xerxes offers his mistress Artyante (who is certainly not a warrior of any kind) an army and the historian adds that this is a peculiarly Persian present Περσικὸν δὲ κάρτα ὁ στρατὸς δῶρον (9. 109).[36] The gift given Artemisia, a panoply, is mentioned only twice in Herodotus's *History* and both times it is in conjunction with women, or to be more precise, Athena.[37] Just as the Persian king is said to present what seem to be rather masculine gifts to women, the reverse is also true: Persian rulers regularly gave their male subjects gold jewelry as gifts—in addition to swords, horses etc.—for Persian men wore necklaces and bracelets.[38]

The Phoenicians

Why is Artemisia's behavior contrasted with that of the Phoenician commanders? (We find a variation on this part of Artemisia's tale in Polyaenus (8. 53. 2), where the Persian king sends Artemisia a Greek panoply, after the queen sinks the ship of her Calyndian ally, but the distaff and spindle go to the commander of Xerxes' fleet, not to the Phoenicians.) While there is no trace of symbolic gifts presented to the Phoenicians in Herodotus, the contrast between Artemisia and the Phoenicians *does* seem to derive from his *History*. Herodotus first introduces Artemisia in the course of describing the contingents in Xerxes' army, and he notes that the Halicarnassian queen's five ships were the "most famous" (7. 99. 3) after those of the Phoenician contingent, which were the largest and best in Xerxes' fleet (7. 89. 1, 96. 1). Almost immediately after telling of Artemisia's successful ploy at Salamis, Herodotus describes how several Phoenicians were punished by an angry Xerxes (8. 90) and their story seems linked to that of the Halicarnassian queen.[39] The Phoenicians sailors have lost their

---

[36] See Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1988a on the meaning of this statement.

[37] Hdt. 1. 60. 4; 4. 180. 3; cf. Benardete 1969, 125.

[38] See e.g. *Anab.* 1. 2. 27 and *Cyr.* 8. 2. 8. For a description of bejeweled Persian men see e.g. Hdt. 9. 80; *Anab.* 1. 5. 8; Ion of Chios *FGrH* 392 F13 and see on Rhodogyne, p. 152.

[39] See Immerwahr 1966, 281–282 on the series of ramming and reversal stories at Salamis.

ships and complain to Xerxes that their vessels were deliberately destroyed by the traitorous Ionians. While they are airing their grievances, the sailors on a Samothracian ship fight bravely, first sinking an Athenian ship, then jumping off their own sinking vessel and capturing an Aeginetan ship. An angry Xerxes, who has observed the skirmish, then turns on the Phoenicians for slandering their betters and orders their heads cut off. Herodotus adds that the Persian Ariaramnes, a friend of the Ionians, is present at the scene and helps bring about the punishment of the Phoenicians.

This tale of the Phoenicians is in many ways a direct contrast to, almost a mirror image of, Artemisia's story. Both Artemisia and Phoenicians experience an unexpected reversal of fortune: the queen survives and is praised for an immoral act while the Phoenicians are executed for what may well be a genuine grievance. The Ionians, who normally, perhaps, were cowardly or treacherous, behave bravely when watched by others, while Artemisia, who is usually quite courageous (cf. 8. 68. α1) behaves in cowardly fashion, but is unobserved. In both stories there is an outsider (Ariaramnes in the case of the Phoenicians, an anonymous companion of the Persian king with Artemisia) who points out to Xerxes what is happening—or seems to be happening—at sea. With Artemisia we are shown that the Persian king does not *see* what has really occurred even though he is personally supervising the battle at Salamis (8. 69. 2; cf. 8. 86). In the case of the Phoenicians Herodotus does not actually tell us whether their accusations against the Ionians are justified or not, but it seems likely that here too Xerxes is mistaken and does not comprehend the real course of events.[40] Both tales close with a pithy, antithetical remark by the Persian king (on women becoming men, cowards slandering braver men). Thus in Herodotus, as in *DM*, the behavior of the Phoenicians is contrasted with that of Artemisia, but only implicitly.

Phoenician ships were an essential part of the Persian navy and after the Athenians faced Phoenician ships at Salamis, the conflict between Greece and Persia was seen at times as a confrontation between the Athenians and the Phoenicians. This led in turn to a more critical or negative portrayal of Phoenicians in Greek writings after Herodotus.[41] Perhaps, then, the spindles and distaffs supposedly

---

[40] Hignett 1963, 236 with n. 1; Immerwahr 1966, 182 and 282.
[41] See Morris 1992, 371–386.

awarded the Phoenicians here owe something to such later prejudices. In Diodorus Siculus' account of Salamis (11. 19), an enraged Xerxes executes some Phoenicians for cowardice and threatens the remaining Phoenician contingent, causing the frightened survivors to desert and return home. It seems likely that this story comes from Ephorus, who may be simply embroidering Herodotus' account.[42] Ephorus liked romantic, picturesque detail[43] and may have included the colorful gifts in his description of Xerxes' angry encounter with the Phoenicians, serving as a source for the tale in *DM*.

Escorting Xerxes' children

ADM concludes his account of Artemisia with the prize awarded her after Salamis. In Herodotus, she appears one more time (8. 101–103), advising Xerxes to return home and leave Mardonius in charge of the campaign against Greece; we have already seen that the Persian king is happy to accept her advice. Xerxes then asks Artemisia to accompany his illegitimate children, who have been on the campaign with him, to Ephesus. It is somewhat surprising to find that Artemisia is given such a task; Plutarch mockingly wonders if Xerxes has forgotten to bring any women from Susa.[44] The vengeful eunuch Hermotimus (8. 103–106) is put in charge of conveying Xerxes' illegitimate children home along with Artemisia and the two make a good pair. Hermotimus is, in a way, as exceptional or "reversed" as Artemisia, for he is ferocious and powerful, but a eunuch.[45]

Artemisia in later sources

Other, later sources generally stress Artemisia's military exploits, either presenting a straightforward account of her bravery, with no mention of any deviousness, or else assigning her even bigger and better deeds. In his *Strategemata* (8. 53) Polyaenus includes several, at times conflicting, accounts of her actions.[46] According to one tale

---

[42] Burn 1984, 467; Hignett 1963, 245–246.
[43] See e.g. Podlecki 1975, 93 and 98.
[44] Plut. *De Herod. Mal.* 38 = *Mor.* 870a; cf. Tourraix 1990, 380.
[45] Cf. Dewald 1981, 125 who mentions a third unusual figure found nearby (8. 104), the bearded priestess at Pedasa.
[46] The stratagem of 8. 53. 4 where Artemisia captures the town of Latmos by a ruse, using flutes and drums rather than force, is generally attributed to a different

(8. 53. 1), Artemisia flees when attacked, while in two others (8. 53. 2, 5) she is, as we have seen, awarded the aristeia at Salamis. Most notable is her supposed trick of changing the insignia on her vessel in accordance with the ships in her vicinity. According to one version found in Polyaenus (8. 53. 1), Artemisia, trapped in the Persian retreat, orders her sailors to take off the ship's Persian standard and then has the ship's captain attack a nearby Persian vessel. In another variation (8. 53. 3), Artemisia has 2 standards when commanding ships at sea—a barbarian one which she flies when pursuing Greeks, and a Greek one for when she herself is being chased by Greeks. Both these amusing accounts are clearly an elaboration of her stratagem in the *History* and the changing or hidden standard seems to come from the remark in Herodotus that Xerxes and the Persian observers could see from shore the name-device on Artemisia's ship (τὸ ἐπίσημον τῆς νεός Hdt. 8. 88. 2).[47]

Another interesting story concerning Artemisia is found in Plutarch's *Themistocles* (14. 3). At Salamis, Plutarch tells us, Ariamenes, Xerxes' brother and the commander of his navy, is attacked by the Greeks and drowns in his armor at sea. Artemisia then notices his body among the wreckage and brings it to Xerxes. The whole tale is intrinsically unlikely, for, as Frost points out, the Persian commander would have sunk like a stone in his armor, but here too Artemisia performs a notable deed at sea.[48]

In a speech attributed to Thessalus, son of the physician Hippocrates, Artemisia is barbaric and less brave. When she attacks the island of Cos and intends to hunt down the Coans cruelly, she is seemingly punished by the gods. Her ships are destroyed by storms at sea, thunderbolts fall on her army, and she sees visions of heroes. The frightened queen departs from Cos without fulfilling her quest.[49]

There is one source in which Artemisia is depicted as a woman with romantic interests. According to Photius (cod. 190, 153 a) Ptolemy Hephaestion (or Chennos) wrote of frustrated lovers who jumped off

---

Artemisia, the wife and sister of Mausolus; see Polyaenus 7. 23. 2; Melber 1885, 483; Hornblower 1982, 322–23.

[47] Cf. Melber 1885, 480–482.

[48] See Frost 1980, 155–157 (ad Plut. *Them.* 14).

[49] [Hippocrates] *Presbeutikos* (*ep.*) 27. 5 (= Littré ix. 414–416). See Jouanna 1984 who contrasts this Artemisia with Herodotus' queen and argues that the Hippocratic speech contains valuable early material.

the cliff Leucas. Ptolemy tells us that Artemisia was in love with a man named Dardanos, but he slighted her. She blinded him while he was asleep, and then threw herself off the cliff, Sappho-style, and died. This passionate, vengeful Artemisia is a very different figure from the warrior queen of Herodotus (and *DM*), or as Weil puts it: "Voilà Artémise récupérée par la féminité au sens le plus banal du mot."[50] It is most likely that our source here, Ptolemy Chennos, a "collector of miscellaneous and mainly false information"[51] is to blame.

All these additional stories point to a rich tradition of Artemisia tales, which may date back to the sophists' early writings[52] or—as seems more likely—were found in later (romantic) histories or *Persicas*. Aristophanes' references to Artemisia (*Lys.* 675; cf. *Thesm.* 1200) indicate that she was already a well-known figure by the end of the fifth century. (ADM, incidentally, seems to assume some knowledge of Artemisia's background on the part of his reader: we are expected to know that "the Persian" is Xerxes and "the naval battle" refers to Salamis.) It is worth noting that stories of Artemisia are, at times, found in conjunction with tales of Themistocles, as in Plutarch's *Themistocles*: comparisons between Artemisia and Themistocles, popular with modern scholars, date back to ancient times.[53] There is, of course, an even more abundant stock of stories about Themistocles in ancient works and any one of a variety of compositions could have been the source of the final section of our notice.

ADM and Artemisia

In conclusion, this notice serves as a twofold warning of the dangers involved in using *DM* by itself as a source. ADM claims that his account of Artemisia is based on Herodotus, but this is true only for the first half of the notice. The second part of his account sounds Herodotean but is not taken from the *History* and this means that we cannot always rely on the source attributions found in *DM*. A second difficulty arises from the brief and somewhat bald format of the notices. The abridged account of Artemisia's bravery creates the mistaken impression that she was conventionally courageous; her complex, duplicitous character has been lost in summarization.

---

50 Weil 1976, 223.
51 Wilson 1983, 196.
52 Cf. Weil 1976, 224.
53 See e.g. Benardete 1969, 193 n. 16; Munson 1988 and cf. Theon *Progym.* 9.

Onomaris

Source: DM is the *only* source on Onomaris.

Galatians[1]

Onomaris the Galatian is perhaps the most elusive figure in *DM*. She is not, it seems, mentioned in any other extant text, and there is no indication as to which author served as ADM's source here. The background to the story—a Galatian, i.e. Gaulish-Celtic tribe suffering from shortages crosses the Ister or lower Danube and successfully invades another land—sounds historical. We hear of Galatians leaving their territory because of insufficient resources, time and again.[2] "Galatian" is the name given to the Celts who crossed over into Greece and Asia Minor from the beginning of the third century onwards, but the term was probably used even earlier for the Celts who invaded Italy and the Balkans in the fourth century.[3] Our story may take place during this fourth century wave of Celt migrations or, perhaps later, if we follow Jullian and assign Onomaris to the tribe of the Scordisci.[4] The Scordisci survived the unsuccessful attack on Delphi by the Galatian leader Brennus in 279 BC and settled near Belgrade. In classical sources, they sound quite fierce: Posidonius tells of their great lust for gold, while Ammianus mentions their habit of using their enemies' skulls as drinking cups.[5] If Onomaris does in fact belong to the Scordisci, she should be assigned a date in the third century BC, but even if we assume that her tale is related to earlier, fourth century Celtic migrations, Onomaris is chronologically the latest woman found in *DM*.

ADM's source

Onomaris' relatively late date has immediate repercussions concerning the unknown author who served as ADM's source for this tale. This

[1] De Puydt 1993 is a useful bibliographical survey of works on the history, archaeology, and nomenclature of the Celts of Galatia.

[2] Plutarch *Cam.* 15; Justin 24. 4. 1; Memnon *FGrH* 434 F8. 8 etc.; cf. Jullian 1920, 283.

[3] Diod. 5. 32. 1; cf. Pausanias 1. 4. 1. See Nachtergael 1977, 13 n. 17; Rankin 1987, 54; Stähelin 1907, 7 n. 5.

[4] Jullian 1906; cf. Tarn 1913, 141–142.

[5] Posidonius fr. 240a (Edelstein-Kidd) = Athen. 234b; Ammianus 27. 4. 4.

writer cannot, of course, have lived before the fourth or third century BC, the time of Onomaris' story, and he may have been considerably later. The Greeks, in any event, knew (and wrote) very little about the Celts before the second century BC. Two of the earliest historians to discuss the Celts in any detail were Ephorus and Timaeus.[6] It is tempting to conjecture that Timaeus served as ADM's source here, just as he was his authority for the notice on Dido, even if there is no real evidence to back up this guess.[7] Other possible candidates are Posidonius or Hieronymus of Cardia, but there were several Hellenistic historians who wrote *Galatica* or on Celtic affairs.[8] Why is there no source citation in our notice? There is clearly a lacuna in our text, where the number of people accompanying Onomaris across the Danube has fallen out and it is possible that more than a number was lost: the missing bit may have continued with a mention of ADM's source. Perhaps the authority for Onomaris' story was cited at the *end* of her notice and has disappeared: this would mean that the original text of *DM* was longer and may even have included more notices on other women (above, p. 30). Another possibility is that our anonymous author relied on oral traditions for this tale. The simplest hypothesis is, of course, that ADM simply did not include a source for this notice.

Onomaris' name and status

Onomaris' name sounds Greek, but the second element "maris" apparently reflects a Celtic form meaning "great". Names containing this *mar* root usually end in -marus for masculine names and -mara (but not -maris) for the corresponding female form, and pairs of -marus/-mara names, such as e.g. Solimarus and Solimara, are attested throughout the Gaulish domain.[9] Interestingly, one possible interpretation of the first part of Onomaris' name, the form *on* or *on(n)o*—a form which is *not* found as a first element of a Celtic personal name—is "river" or "water".[10] It is tempting to relate these

---

[6] Momigliano 1975, 50–73, esp. 58–59.
[7] See Dottin 1906 vs. Jullian 1906.
[8] Nachtergael 1977, 49–82 discusses and analyzes the fragments of eight such Hellenistic historians who wrote about the Celts; see too Tierney 1960, esp. 193–197 and Rankin 1987, 71–72.
[9] See Holder 1904, 432–433; Schmidt 1957, 48 and 238 n. 2; Evans 1967, 223–228. Cf. too Dottin 1906, 123 and compare Plutarch's Galatian heroine, Chiomara (*Mor.* 258d–f).
[10] See Holder 1904, 852–860, esp. 857–858 and cf. Evans 1967, 370–371.

two words, "great" and "river" to Onomaris' story, the tale of a great woman who crossed a river, but the etymology rests on very shaky ground. Another shaky, but attractive etymology is to link the ending of Onomaris name, *ris*, to the suffix -rix meaning "king" or "ruler".[11]

Onomaris is said to be one of the distinguished Galatians and this is probably a reference to the difference in status between ordinary tribesmen and leaders found in the aristocratic political system of the Galatians.[12] In other words, it is possible that Onomaris came from a leading family: she *may* have been the mother, daughter, wife, widow or sister of a chief. But since "status was not immutably fixed at birth . . . and it was possible to rise . . . in [Celtic] society by virtue of one's acts",[13] perhaps Onomaris *became* distinguished.

Celtic women

It is not surprising to find a Galatian or Celtic woman included in *DM*, for Celtic women were often portrayed by classical writers as brave and warlike. The fierce, barbaric women of the Celts undoubtedly owe something to Greek anthropological stereotypes,[14] but these women probably were more independent and powerful than their Greek counterparts. Rich grave goods found in 6th–4th century BC tombs of Celtic females point to the high social status of these women and may indicate that certain women were leaders or chieftains in their own right.[15] Aristotle has the curious statement that the Celts, unlike most belligerent nations, are not controlled by women (γυναικοκρατούμενοι), because they openly approve of homosexuality (*Pol.* 1269 b24–27), and later authors echo his statement on the Celts' homosexuality.[16] While the Celts were certainly not controlled by their women, there is ample literary evidence for the lively and

[11] Cf. Schmidt 1957, 75 and 260 for personal names ending in -ris. Onomaris is not included in the list of Galatian personal names compiled by Stähelin 1907, 109–120, nor is she found in Holder 1904, Weisgerber 1931, Schmidt 1957, or Evans 1967; see too De Puydt 1993, 243–245.

[12] Jullian 1906, 124; Rankin 1987, 66, 77, 192–193; Champion 1995, 90–93.

[13] Champion 1995, 92.

[14] See e.g. Strabo 4. 4. 3, who describes the alleged reversal of gender roles in Gaul as typical of barbarian societies and cf. Rankin 1987, 78 and 253; Green 1995, 22–24.

[15] See Ehrenberg 1989, 168–171; Green 1995, 17–18.

[16] Athen. 603a; Diod. 5. 32. 7. Rankin 1987, 55 and 78 thinks that this may be related to a ritual abstinence from women by Celt warriors.

independent character of female Celts. Thus Celtic women accompanied their men folk to the battlefield, often as bystanders, but occasionally as participants.[17] Galatian women are said to be the equal of their men in stature and courage and in one amusing description we hear of a female Gaul even stronger than her husband, who with swollen neck, grinding teeth, and flaying arms, delivers kicks to an opponent.[18] Plutarch, in his *Mulierum Virtutes*, devotes no less than four of his 26 notices on outstanding women to Celtic women. In one notice we learn of the good sense and fairness of Celtic women as a group: they arbitrate between warring factions and prevent a civil war. When the Celts make a treaty with Hannibal, we are told, Celtic women are appointed to judge grievances that may arise.[19] Later in his work, Plutarch includes three consecutive tales of individual Galatian women (*Mor.* 257e–258f). One, Camma, avenges the assassination of her husband and commits suicide; another, Chiomara, arranges the death of a Roman who raped her and subsequently brings his head to her husband.

Boadicea

The outstanding Celtic warrior queen was of course Boadicea (or more correctly Boudica).[20] Tacitus states that the Britons did not distinguish between male and female when it came to leadership (*Ag.* 16. 1) and his Boadicea adds that the Britons were regularly led in war by women (*Ann.* 14. 35. 1). In an exhortation to her forces, Tacitus' Boadicea plays with gender roles, contrasting her determination—as a woman—to fight, with the willingness of males to live as slaves *id mulieri destinatum: viverent viri et servirent.* (*Ann.* 14. 35. 4). We know, in fact, of only one other Celtic warrior queen, Cartimandua of the Brigantes, and she is said to have encountered opposition because of her sex: Tacitus says that her people were stirred to rebel by the ignominy of submitting to the rule of a woman.[21]

---

[17] See e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 14. 34 and cf. *Ger.* 7–8. See too Rankin 1987, 252–253; Ehrenberg 1989, 162–168; Green 1995, 20–22, 28–33.

[18] Ammianus 15. 12. 1; cf. Diod. 5. 32. 3 and see Fraser 1988, 59; Rankin 1987, 253.

[19] Plutarch, *Mor.* 246 b–d; see Stadter 1965, 57 on Celtic women as advisers in matters of war.

[20] Fraser 1988, 43–106 has a lively account of Boadicea. Macdonald 1987b is an illuminating survey of the various recastings of Boadicea's story which emphasize either her womanliness or her role as a warrior.

[21] *Stimulante ignominia ne feminae imperio subderentur* (*Ann.* 12. 40. 5); cf. *Hist.* 3. 45 and see Ehrenberg 1989, 167–168.

Onomaris as leader

Boadicea is the widow of a king and inherits her position of power, and thus resembles most of the women of *DM.* Onomaris is interesting precisely because she does not follow this pattern: she does not take over in place of a male, but leads her fellow Galatians by virtue of the fact that she, unlike any of the men, is willing to undertake the task. Like Artemisia, Onomaris seems to have been the only "man" present in a crisis. The fact that Onomaris' fellow tribe members are ready to follow whoever is willing to lead them[22] and that no man steps forward indicates that their situation was fairly desperate. In what way was Onomaris equipped for the role of leader? What sort of woman was she? Should we conjecture a fierce figure, akin to the strapping, harsh-voiced Boadicea described by Dio Cassius (62. 2. 3–4) or a beautiful and cunning woman along the lines of Medb, the woman-goddess heroine of the *Táin Bó Cuailnge*?[23] As usual, ADM gives no hint as to the physical appearance of the women he describes and we have no idea of Onomaris' character, beyond her initiative and courage. Perhaps she displayed intelligence and artfulness as well. Jullian suggests that Onomaris was not an ordinary woman, but a priestess or perhaps even a goddess who possessed magical or religious powers of some kind. Elsewhere we hear of omens in relation to the movements of the Galatians, and Jullian thinks that Onomaris may have been privy to some such sign as well, which led to the crossing of the Danube.[24] But since none of the other women included in *DM* are endowed with supernatural powers, it does not seem likely that Onomaris was more than mortal, at least in the source used by ADM.

Sharing and giving

An interesting feature of our brief tale is the pooling of resources arranged by Onomaris before the Galatians set out on their expedition, where all their wealth is placed in public, in common.[25] Elsewhere

[22] Jullian 1906, 124 notes a parallel with Germans in Caesar *BG* 6. 23. 7.

[23] For brief characterizations of Medb, see Fraser 1988, 14–17; Rankin 1987, 251–252; Green 1995, 79–81.

[24] See Jullian 1906, 124; 1920, 285 with n. 2. and cf. Justin 24. 4. 1–4; Livy 5. 34. 2, 9. Green 1995, 31–33 notes the links between Boadicea and Andraste, the Celtic war goddess.

[25] Compare the members of a Celtiberian tribe who share out the fruits of a harvest equally (Diod. 5. 34. 3).

we hear of potlatch giving by Galatian chiefs, where the prodigious generosity of a leader is meant to confer prestige upon him and confirm his status. One Galatian leader builds halls where 400 people can feast; another scatters gold and silver to the crowds who follow him and offers vast quantities of food and wine. We also hear that Celts competed at feasts for the champion's portion.[26] If normally the Galatians were a competitive, honor bound group and clientship was the most important means used to differentiate individuals of different status,[27] Onomaris, it seems, wanted to avoid both prodigality and unnecessary contention, by holding property in common.[28] Perhaps this willingness to forgo rivalry and prestige is a particularly womanly quality: we are reminded of Plutarch's judicious Celtic women who adjudicate rival claims and prevent civil strife.

A fitting conclusion

Onomaris, an independent heroine with more courage and initiative than the male Galatians who surround her, is a suitable figure to close our collection of intelligent and intrepid women. We know that Onomaris guides her people to a new territory, defeats the local inhabitants, and becomes queen of a new land. She is, perhaps, from aristocratic stock, but nonetheless achieves her position of power through her leadership abilities, rather than family connections. Her brief tale only whets our curiosity. What were Onomaris' special qualities? Was she simply an outstanding warrior? Or unusually clever? What sort of queen was she, once the Galatians conquered their new territory? In many ways, this final section embodies both the chief failing and the chief virtue of the short series of notices which comprise *DM*. The information given us piques our interest, but does not supply us with a sufficient amount of material to satisfy our curiosity or reconstruct Onomaris' life and character in an adequate manner. And yet if it were not for our anonymous author, ADM and his collection of intelligent and courageous women, Onomaris and her story would have been lost altogether.

---

[26] Athen. 150 d–f = Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F2; Athen. 152 e–f = Posidonius fr. 67 (Edelstein-Kidd); Athen. 154c = Posidonius fr. 68 (E.–K.). Mauss himself discusses the Celts' potlatch giving—see Mauss 1925; Hubert 1925; Rankin 1987, 60–67.

[27] See Champion 1995, 92.

[28] Compare Caesar *BG* 6. 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Africa, T. (1982). "Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History." *CA* 1: 1–17.

Alexander, L. (1913). *The Kings of Lydia.* Princeton.

Ament, E. J. (1993). "Aspects of Androgyny in Classical Greece" in: *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* Ed. M. DeForest. Wauconda, Illinois, 1–31.

Anderson, G. (1984). *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World.* London and Sydney.

—— (1986). *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* London.

Andreasen, N.-E. A. (1983). "The Role of the Queen Mother in Israelite Society." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45: 179–194.

Annas, J. (1981). *An Introduction to Plato's Republic.* Oxford.

Ardener, S. (1978). "Introduction: The Nature of Women in Society." in: *Defining Females: The Nature of Women in Society* Ed. S. Ardener. London, 9–48.

Arthur, M. B. (1973). "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women." *Arethusa* 6: 7–58. Reprinted in Peradotto and Sullivan 1984.

—— (1981). "The Divided World of *Iliad* VI." in: *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* Ed. H. Foley. New York, 19–44.

Asheri, D. (1988). *Erodoto, Le Storie.* i. Milan.

—— (1991–92). "The Art of Synchronization in Greek Historiography: The Case of Timaeus of Tauromenium." *SCI* 11: 52–89.

Atkinson, K. M. (1956). "The Legitimacy of Cambyses and Darius as Kings of Egypt." *JAOS* 76: 167–177.

Aubet, M. E. (1993). *The Phoenicians and the West.* Cambridge.

Austin, R. G. (1971). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus.* Oxford.

—— (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus.* Oxford.

Avery, H. C. (1979). "A Poetic Word in Herodotus." *Hermes* 107: 1–9.

Barber, E. W. (1994). *Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years: Women, Cloth and Society in Early Times.* New York and London.

Baumgartner, W. (1959). "Herodots Babylonische und Assyrische Nachrichten." in: *Zum Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt: Ausgewählte Aufsätze.* Leiden, 282–331.

Beagon, M. (1992). *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder.* Oxford.

Beall, S. M. (1993). "Word-Painting in the 'Imagines' of the Elder Philostratus." *Hermes* 121: 350–363.

Beaulieu, P.-A. (1989). *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556–539 B.C.* New Haven.

Ben-Barak, Z. (1980). "Inheritance by Daughters in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 25: 22–33.

—— (1987). "The Queen Consort and the Struggle for Succession to the Throne." in: *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient antique: XXXIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* Ed. J.-M. Durand. Paris, 33–40.

Benardete, S. (1969). *Herodotean Inquiries.* The Hague.

Beye, C. R. (1964). "Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues." *HSCP* 68: 345–373.

—— (1968). *The Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Epic Tradition.* London and Melbourne.

Bickel, E. (1915). *Diatribe in Senecae Philosophi Fragmenta.* i. Leipzig,

Bigwood, J. M. (1976). "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus." *Phoenix* 30: 1–25.

—— (1978). "Ctesias' Description of Babylon." *AJAH* 3: 32–52.

—— (1980). "Diodorus and Ctesias." *Phoenix* 34: 195–207.
—— (1986). "*POXY* 2330 and Ctesias." *Phoenix* 40: 393–406.
Biltcliffe, D. A. W. (1969). "*P. Ox.* No. 2330 and its importance for the study of Nicolaus of Damascus." *RhM* 112: 85–93.
Blok, J. (1994). *The Early Amazons: Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth.* Leiden.
Bluestone, N. H. (1987). *Women and the Ideal Society: Plato's Republic and Modern Myths of Gender.* Oxford and New York.
Boncquet, J. (1987). *Diodorus Siculus (II, 1–34) over Mesopotamië: Een historische kommentaar.* Brussels.
Bowersock, G. W. (1969). *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire.* Oxford.
Bowra, C. M. (1930). *Tradition and Design in the Iliad.* Oxford.
Boyce, M. (1982). *A History of Zoroastrianism.* ii. Leiden.
Braun, M. (1938). *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature.* Oxford.
Bremmer, J. (1983). "The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium." *ZPE* 50: 173–186.
Briant, P. (1992). "Les tablettes de bois du Grand Roi et les lettres d'Atossa." *DATA: Achaemenid History Newsletter* 1: Note 1, 2.
Brosius, M. (1996). *Women in Ancient Persia: 559–331 B.C.* Oxford.
Brown, S. (1991). *Late Carthaginian Child Sacrifice and Sacrificial Monuments in their Mediterranean Context.* Sheffield.
Brown, S. C. (1988). "The Medikos Logos of Herodotus and the Evolution of the Median State." in: *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory* Eds. A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Leiden, 71–86.
Brunt, P. A. (1993). "Thessalian Medism." in: *Studies in Greek History and Thought.* Oxford, 80–83.
Buck, C. D. (1914). "Is the Suffix of βασίλισσα etc. of Macedonian Origin?" *CP* 9: 370–373.
Buitelaar, M. (1995). "Widows' Worlds: Representations and Realities." in: *Between Poverty and the Pyre: Moments in the History of Widowhood* Eds. J. Bremmer and L. van den Bosch. London, 1–18.
Bunnens, G. (1986). "Aspects religieux de l'expansion phénicienne." in: *Studia Phoenicia IV: Religio Phoenicia* Eds. C. Bonnet, E. Lipinski and P. Marchetti. Namur, 119–125.
Burkert, W. (1983). *Homo Necans.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Burn, A. R. (1984). *Persia and the Greeks.*² London.
Burstein, S. M. (1978). *The Babyloniaca of Berossus.* Malibu.
Butterworth, J. (1986). "Homer and Hesiod." in: *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster* i. Eds. J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker and J. R. Green. Bristol, 33–45.
Buxton, R. (1994). *Imaginary Greece: The contexts of mythology.* Cambridge.
Calame, C. (1987). "Spartan Genealogies: The Mythological Representation of a Spatial Organization." in: *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* Ed. J. Bremmer. London, 153–186.
Calmeyer, P. (1987). "Greek Historiography and Achaemenid Reliefs." in: *Achaemenid History ii: The Greek Sources* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt. Leiden, 11–26.
Campbell Thompson, R. (1937). "An Assyrian Parallel to an Incident in the Story of Semiramis." *Iraq* 4: 35–43.
Cantarella, E. (1987). *Pandora's Daughters.* Baltimore and London.
Carlier, P. (1984). *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre.* Strasburg.
Carney, E. (1991). "'What's in a Name?' The Emergence of a Title for Royal Women in the Hellenistic Period." in: *Women's History and Ancient History* Ed. S. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill, 154–172.
—— (1995). "Women and *Basileia*: Legitimacy and Female Political Action in Macedonia." *CJ* 90: 367–391.

Casevitz, M. (1985). "La femme dans l'oeuvre de Diodore de Sicile." in: *La femme dans le monde méditerranéen i: Antiquité.* Lyon, 113–135.
Celoria, F. (1992). *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis.* London and New York.
Cerny, J. (1954). "Consanguineous Marriages in Pharaonic Egypt." *JEA* 40: 23–29.
Chamoux, F. (1953). *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades.* Paris.
Champion, T. (1995). "Power, Politics and Status." in: *The Celtic World* Ed. M. J. Green. London and New York, 85–94.
Christ, M. R. (1994). "Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry." *CA* 13: 167–202.
Coche-Zivie, C. (1972). "Nitocris, Rhodopis et la troisième pyramide de Giza." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 72: 115–138.
Cohen, I. M. (1989–90). "Traditional Language and the Women in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women.*" *SCI* 10: 12–27.
Connor, W. R. (1968). *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens.* Washington, D.C.
Cook, J. M. (1983). *The Persian Empire.* London
Corcella, A. (1993). *Erodoto, Le Storie.* iv. Milan.
Dain, A. (1950). "Un Manuscrit de Polyen, Le Scorialensis T-I-12." *Emerita* 18: 425–439.
Dandamayev, M. A. (1979). "Data of the Babylonian Documents from the 6th to the 5th Centuries BC on the Sakas." in: *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia* Ed. J. Harmatta. Budapest, 95–109.
de Boor, C. (1890). "Zu den Fragmenten des Aelian." *RhM* 45: 477–480.
De Puydt, C. (1993). "Essai de synthèse bibliographique sur les Celtes de Galatie." *Ollodagos* 5: 227–246.
Demand, N. (1982). *Thebes in the Fifth Century.* London and Boston.
Descat, R. (1994). "Darius, le roi kapelos." in: *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt and M. C. Root. Leiden, 161–166.
Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant (1978). *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* Chicago and London.
Devereux, G. (1973). "The Self-blinding of Oidipous in Sophokles: *Oidipous Tyrannos.*" *JHS* 93: 36–49.
Dewald, C. (1981). "Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories.*" in: *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* Ed. H. Foley. New York, 91–125.
Diakonoff, I. M. (1985). "Media." in: *Cambridge History of Iran ii: Median and Achaemenian Periods* Ed. I. Gershevitch. Cambridge, 36–148.
Dillery, J. (1992). "Darius and the Tomb of Nitocris (Hdt. 1. 187)." *CP* 87: 30–38.
Dittmar, H. (1912). *Aischines von Sphettos.* Berlin.
Dottin, G. (1906). "Le passage du Danube par les Galates." *REA* 8: 123.
Dougherty, C. (1993). *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece.* New York and Oxford.
Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger.* London.
Dover, K. J. (1974). *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle.* Oxford.
Drews, R. (1965). "Assyria in Classical Universal Histories." *Historia* 14: 129–142.
—— (1970). "Herodotus' Other *Logoi.*" *AJP* 91: 181–191.
—— (1973). *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History.* Cambridge, Mass.
—— (1974). "Sargon, Cyrus and Mesopotamian Folk History." *JNES* 33: 387–393.
du Bois, P. (1982). *Centaurs and Amazons: Women and the Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being.* Ann Arbor, Michigan,
Durand, J.-M., Ed. (1987). *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient antique: XXXIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale.* Paris.
Eddy, S. K. (1961). *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* Lincoln, Nebraska.
Edwards, M. W. (1980). "The Structure of Homeric Catalogues." *TAPA* 110: 81–105.
—— (1987). *Homer, Poet of the Iliad.* Baltimore and London.

—— (1991). *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume v: Books 17–20*. Cambridge.
Ehlers, B. (1966). *Eine vorplatonische Deutung des sokratischen Eros*. Munich.
Ehrenberg, M. (1989). *Women in Prehistory*. London.
Eilers, W. (1971). *Semiramis: Entstehung und Nachhall einer altorientalischen Sage*. Vienna.
Evans, D. E. (1967). *Gaulish Personal Names*. Oxford.
Fantham, E., H. P. Foley, N. B. Kampen, S. B. Pomeroy and H. A. Shapiro, Eds. (1994). *Women in the Classical World*. New York and Oxford.
Fehling, D. (1989). *Herodotus and his "Sources": Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*. Leeds.
Finckh, C. E. (1860). "Zu Demetrius περὶ ἑρμηνείας 213." *Philologus* 15: 153–154.
Finkelberg, M. (1991). "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece." *CQ* 41: 303–316.
Flory, S. (1987). *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*. Detroit.
Foley, H., Ed. (1994). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Princeton.
Forrest, W. G. (1968). *A History of Sparta: 950–192 B.C.* London.
Fortenbaugh, W. W., *et al.* (1992). *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*. ii. Leiden.
Frame, G. (1992). *Babylonia 689–627 B.C.: A Political History*. Leiden.
Fraser, A. (1988). *The Warrior Queens: Boadicea's Chariot*. London.
Fraser, P. (1972). *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. i–iii. Oxford.
Frost, F. J. (1980). *Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary*. Princeton.
Frye, R. N. (1984). *The History of Ancient Iran*. Munich.
Gadd, C. J. (1958). "The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus." *Anatolian Studies* 8: 35–92.
Gardiner, A. (1961). *Egypt of the Pharaohs*. Oxford.
Garrison, E. P. (1991). "Attitudes toward Suicide in Ancient Greece." *TAPA* 121: 1–34.
Geiger, J. (1985). *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*. Stuttgart.
Georges, P. (1994). *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience*. Baltimore and London.
Gera, D. L. (1993). *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*. Oxford.
Giannini, A. (1965). *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae*. Milan.
Gilmore, J. (1888). *The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias*. London.
Goossens, G. (1940). "L'histoire d'Assyrie de Ctésias." *AC* 9: 25–45.
Gould, J. (1980). "Law, Custom and Myth: aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens." *JHS* 100: 38–59.
—— (1989). *Herodotus*. London.
Graf, D. F. (1984). "Medism: The Origin and Significance of the Term." *JHS* 104: 15–30.
Graf, F. (1984). "Women, War, and Warlike Divinities." *ZPE* 55: 245–254.
Gray, V. J. (1989). *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*. London.
Grayson, A. K. (1975). *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Locust Valley, N.Y.
—— (1982). "Assyria: Ashur-dan II to Ashur-Nirari V (934–745 BC)." in: *Cambridge Ancient History* iii. 1[2] Eds. J. Boardman, I. E. S. Edwards, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger. Cambridge, 238–281.
—— (1991). "Assyria: Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (704–669 BC)." in: *Cambridge Ancient History* iii. 2[2] Eds. J. Boardman, I. E. S. Edwards, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger. Cambridge, 103–141.
Green, M. (1995). *Celtic Goddesses: Warriors, Virgins and Mothers*. London.
Grimal, N. (1992). *A History of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford.
Gronewald, M. (1979). "Bemerkenswerte Frauen in *P. Oxy.* 441 (= Pack[2] 1995)." *ZPE* 36: 49–50.
Grosz, K. (1987). "Daughters Adopted as Sons at Nuzi and Emar." in: *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient antique: XXXIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* Ed. J.-M. Durand. Paris, 81–86.
Grote, G. (1888). *Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates*. iv.[3] London.

Grottanelli, C. (1972). "I connotati "fenici" della morte di Elissa." *Religioni e Civiltà* 1: 319–327.
Guyot, P. (1980). *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike.* Stuttgart.
Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy.* Oxford.
Halliwell, S. (1993). *Plato: Republic 5.* Warminster.
Halperin, D. M. (1990). "Why is Diotima a Woman?" in: *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality.* London and New York, 113–151, 190–211.
Harden, D. (1962). *The Phoenicians.* London.
Hardwick, L. (1990). "Ancient Amazons-Heroes, Outsiders or Women?" *G&R* 37: 14–36.
Harris, R. (1989). "Independent Women in Ancient Mesopotamia?" in: *Women's Earliest Records: From Ancient Egypt and Western Asia* Ed. B. S. Lesko. Atlanta, 145–156.
Hart, J. (1982). *Herodotus and Greek History.* London and Canberra.
Hartog, F. (1988). *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Harvey, D. (1985). "Women in Thucydides." *Arethusa* 18: 67–90.
Hawley, R. (1993). "'Pretty, Witty and Wise': Courtesans in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistai* Book 13." *International Journal of Moral and Social Studies* 8: 73–91.
—— (1994). "The Problem of Women Philosophers in Ancient Greece." in: *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night* Eds. L. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke. London, 70–87.
Heeren, A. H. L. (1789). "Tractatus Anonymi de Mulieribus quae Bello Claruerunt." *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst* 6: 3–24.
Helm, P. R. (1980). "Greeks" in the Neo-Assyrian Levant and "Assyria" in Early Greek Writers. Diss. Pennsylvania.
—— (1981). "Herodotus' *Mêdikos Logos* and Median History." *Iran* 19: 85–90.
Henderson, J. (1987). *Aristophanes Lysistrata.* Oxford.
Herter, H. (1967). "Xenophilos." *RE* ix A2: 1566–1567.
Heubeck, A., S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth (1988). *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* i. Oxford.
Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra (1989). *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* ii. Oxford.
Hexter, R. (1992). "Sidonian Dido." in: *Innovations of Antiquity* Eds. R. Hexter and D. Selden. New York and London, 332–384.
Hignett, C. (1963). *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece.* Oxford.
Hirzel, R. (1895). *Der Dialog: Ein literarhistorischer Versuch.* i. Leipzig.
Hock, R. F. and E. N. O'Neil (1986). *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric i: The Progymnasmata.* Atlanta.
Holder, A. (1904). *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz.* ii: I–T. Leipzig; repr. Graz 1962.
Hollis, A. S. (1977). *Ovid, Ars Amatoria: Book I.* Oxford.
Honeyman, A. M. (1947). "Varia Punica." *AJP* 68: 77–82.
Hopkins, K. (1978). *Conquerors and Slaves.* Cambridge.
—— (1980). "Brother-Sister Marriage in Roman Egypt." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22: 303–354.
Hornblower, S. (1982). *Mausolus.* Oxford.
—— (1987). *Thucydides.* London.
Horsfall, N. (1990). "Dido in the Light of History." in: *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* Ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford, 127–144.
How, W. W. and J. Wells (1912). *A Commentary on Herodotus.* i–ii. Oxford.
Hubert, H. (1925). "Le système des prestations totales dans les littératures celtiques." *Revue Celtique* 42: 330–335.
Humphreys, S. C. (1983). *The Family, Women and Death.* London.
Huss, W. (1985). *Geschichte der Karthager.* Munich.

Immerwahr, H. R. (1966). *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Cleveland.
Jacobson, H. (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton.
Jacoby, F. (1922). "Ktesias." *RE* xi.2: 2032–2073.
Janko, R. (1982). *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
—— (1992). *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume iv: Books 13–16*. Cambridge.
Jouanna, J. (1984). "Collaboration ou résistance au barbare: Artémise d'Halicarnasse et Cadmos de Cos chez Hérodote et Hippocrate." *Ktema* 9: 15–26.
Jullian, C. (1906). "À propos des Scordisques." *REA* 8: 124.
—— (1920). *Histoire de la Gaule*.[4] i. Paris.
Justi, F. (1895). *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg; repr. Hildesheim 1963.
Kahn, C. H. (1994). "Aeschines on Socratic Eros." in: *The Socratic Movement* Ed. P. A. Vander Waerdt. Ithaca, 87–106.
Kakridis, J. T. (1972). "Probleme der griechischen Heldensage." *Poetica* 5: 152–163.
Kellens, J. (1991). "Questions préalables." in: *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide* Ed. J. Kellens. Ghent, 81–86.
Kerferd, G. B. (1981). *The Sophistic Movement*. Cambridge.
Keuls, E. C. (1993). *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*.[2] Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Kirk, G. S. (1965). *Homer and the Epic*. Cambridge.
Kleingünther, A. (1933). ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*. Leipzig; repr. New York 1976.
Knott, O. (1884). "De fide et fontibus Polyaeni." *Commentationes Philologae Ienenses* 3: 49–96.
Konstan, D. (1987). "Persians, Greeks and Empire." *Arethusa* 20: 59–73.
Kowalski, J. (1929). *De Didone Graeca et Latina*. Cracow.
Krentz, P. and E. L. Wheeler (1994). *Polyaenus, Stratagems of War*. i–ii. Chicago.
Kühner, R. and B. Gerth (1898). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*.[3] ii. 1. Hanover and Leipzig.
Kuhrt, A. (1987). "Assyrian and Babylonian Traditions in Classical Authors: A Critical Synthesis." in: *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jht. v. Chr.*[2] Eds. H. J. Nissen and J. Renger. Berlin, 539–553.
—— (1988). "Babylonia from Cyrus to Xerxes." in: *Cambridge Ancient History* iv.[2] Eds. J. Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis and M. Ostwald. Cambridge, 112–138.
—— (1990). "Alexander and Babylon." in: *Achaemenid History V: The Roots of the European Tradition* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J. W. Drijvers. Leiden, 121–130.
Lambert, W. G. (1987). "Goddesses in the Pantheon: A Reflection of Women in Society?" in: *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient antique: XXXIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* Ed. J.-M. Durand. Paris, 125–130.
Lamberton, R. (1988). *Hesiod*. New Haven.
Lancel, S. (1995). *Carthage, A History*. Oxford.
Landi, C. (1895). "Opuscula de fontibus mirabilibus, de Nilo etc. ex cod. Laur. 56,1 descripta." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 3: 531–548.
Lateiner, D. (1982). "A Note on the Perils of Prosperity in Herodotus." *RhM* 125: 97–101.
—— (1989). *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto.
—— (1990). "Deceptions and Delusions in Herodotus." *CA* 9: 230–246.
Lattimore, R. (1939). "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus." *CP* 34: 24–35.
Lefkowitz, M. (1981). *Heroines and Hysterics*. London.
—— (1986). *Women in Greek Myth*. London.
Legrand, P. E. (1945). *Hérodote, Histoires: Livre IV*. Paris, Budé.
—— (1948). *Hérodote, Histoires: Livre VI*. Paris, Budé.

—— (1970). *Hérodote, Histoires: Livre I.*[5] Paris, Budé.
Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. (1910). "Semiramis." *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* iv. Ed. W. H. Roscher. Leipzig, 678–702.
Lesko, B. S., Ed. (1989). *Women's Earliest Records: From Ancient Egypt and Western Asia.* Atlanta.
Levine, A.-J. (1995). "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith." in: *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* Ed. A. Brenner. Sheffield, 208–223.
Levine, L. D. (1973). "Review of Eilers 1971." *JNES* 32: 260–261.
Lewis, B. (1980). *The Sargon Legend: A Study of the Akkadian Text and the Tale of the Hero who was Exposed at Birth.* Cambridge, Mass.
Lewy, H. (1952). "Nitokris-Naqi'a." *JNES* 11: 264–286.
Lloyd, A. B. (1975–88). *Herodotus Book II: Introduction and Commentary.* i–iii. Leiden.
Lloyd-Jones, H. (1975). *Female of the Species: Semonides on Women.* London.
Loraux, N. (1993). *The Children of Athena.* Princeton.
Lord, M. L. (1969). "Dido as an Example of Chastity: The Influence of Example Literature." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 17: 22–44, 216–232.
Luckenbill, D. D. (1926). *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylon.* i. Chicago.
Lutz, C. E. (1947). "Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates." *YCS* 10: 3–150.
Macan, R. W. (1895). *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books.* i–ii. London; repr. New York 1973.
Macdonald, S. (1987a). "Drawing the Lines- Gender, Peace and War: An Introduction." in: *Images of Women in Peace and War* Eds. S. Macdonald, P. Holden and S. Ardener. Basingstoke and London, 1–26.
—— (1987b). "Boadicea: Warrior, Mother, and Myth." in: *Images of Women in Peace and War* Eds. S. Macdonald, P. Holden and S. Ardener. Basingstoke and London, 40–61.
MacGinnis, J. (1986). "Herodotus' Description of Babylon." *BICS* 33: 67–86.
Macqueen, J. G. (1978). "The Ἀσσύριοι λόγοι of Herodotus and their Position in the *Histories.*" *CQ* 28: 284–291.
Marquart, J. (1891–3). "Die Assyriaka des Ktesias." *Philologus* Suppl. 6: 501–658.
Mauss, M. (1925). "Sur un texte de Posidonius: Le suicide contre-prestation suprême." *Revue Celtique* 42: 324–329.
McLeod, G. (1991). *Virtue and Venom: Catalogs of Women from Antiquity to the Renaissance.* Ann Arbor.
Meier, S. A. (1991). "Women and Communication in the Ancient Near East." *JAOS* 111: 540–547.
Meiggs, R. and D. M. Lewis (1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* Oxford.
Melber, J. (1885). "Über die Quellen und den Wert der Strategemensammlung Polyäns." *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* Suppl. Bd. 14: 417–688.
Merkelbach, R. and M. L. West (1967). *Fragmenta Hesiodea.* Oxford.
Meyer, E. (1909). *Theopomps Hellenika.* Halle; repr. Hildesheim 1966.
Mitchell, B. M. (1966). "Cyrene and Persia." *JHS* 86: 99–113.
Momigliano, A. (1969). "Tradizione e Invenzione in Ctesia." in: *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mundo antico.* Rome, 181–212.
—— (1971). *The Development of Greek Biography.* Cambridge, Mass.
—— (1975). *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge.
Monti, R. C. (1981). *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid: Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic.* Leiden.
Moore, C. A. (1985). *Judith.* Garden City, N.Y.
Morris, S. P. (1992). *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art.* Princeton.
Morrison, J. S. (1942). "Meno of Pharsalus, Polycrates, and Ismenias." *CQ* 36: 57–78.
Moscati, S. (1968). *The World of the Phoenicians.* London.

Munson, R. V. (1988). "Artemisia in Herodotus." *CA* 7: 91–106.

Muscarella, O. W. (1994). "Miscellaneous Median Matters." in: *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt and M. C. Root. Leiden, 57–64.

Nachtergael, G. (1977). *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes.* Brussels.

Nagel, W. (1982). *Ninus und Semiramis in Sage und Geschichte.* Berlin.

Natorp, P. (1892). "Aischines' Aspasia." *Philologus* 51: 489–500.

Neuhaus, O. (1901). "Die Ueberlieferung über Aspasia von Phokaia." *RhM* 56: 272–283.

Newberry, P. E. (1943). "Queen Nitocris of the Sixth Dynasty." *JEA* 29: 51–54.

Norden, E. (1957). *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI.*[4] Stuttgart.

Oden, R. A. (1977). *Studies in Lucian's De Syria Dea.* Missoula.

Osann, F. (1843). "Der Sophist Hippias als Archäolog." *RhM* 2: 495–510.

Papadopoulou-Belmehdi, I. (1994). *Le chant de Pénélope: Poétique du tissage féminin dans l'Odyssée.* Paris.

Parke, H. W. and D. E. W. Wormell (1956). *The Delphic Oracle.* i–ii. Oxford.

Parker, R. A. and W. H. Dubberstein (1956). *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.–A.D. 75.* Providence, Rhode Island.

Patterson, O. (1982). *Slavery and Social Death.* Cambridge, Mass.

Pearson, L. (1987). *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and his Predecessors.* Atlanta.

Pease, A. S. (1935). *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus.* Cambridge, Mass.

Pedley, J. G. (1972). *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis.* Cambridge, Mass.

Pelling, C. B. R. (1991). "Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus." in: *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* Eds. M. A. Flower and M. Toher. London, 120–142.

Peradotto, J. and J. P. Sullivan, Eds. (1984). *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers.* Albany, N.Y.

Perret, J. (1964). "Les compagnes de Didon aux Enfers." *REL* 42: 247–261.

Perry, B. E. (1967). *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Pervo, R. I. (1991). "Aseneth and her Sisters: Women in Jewish Narrative and in the Greek Novels." in: "*Women Like This*": *New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* Ed. A.-J. Levine. Atlanta, 145–160.

Pettinato, G. (1988). *Semiramis: Herrin über Assur und Babylon. Biographie.* Zurich and Munich.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968). *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age.* Oxford.

Phillips, E. D. (1968). "Semiramis at Behistun." *C&M* 29: 162–168.

Podlecki, A. J. (1975). *The Life of Themistocles.* Montreal and London.

Pomeroy, S. B. (1984). *Women in Hellenistic Egypt.* New York..

Prandi, L. (1979). "La 'fides punica' e il pregiudizio anticartaginese." in: *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità* Ed. M. Sordi. Milan, 90–97.

Pritchard, J. B., Ed. (1969). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.*[3] Princeton.

Pritchett, W. K. (1974). *The Greek State at War: Part II.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.

—— (1993). *The Liar School of Herodotos.* Amsterdam.

Rankin, H. D. (1987). *Celts and the Classical World.* London and Sydney.

Ravn, O. E. (1942). *Herodotus' Description of Babylon.* Copenhagen.

Reade, J. (1987). "Was Sennacherib a Feminist?" in: *La Femme dans le Proche-Orient antique: XXXIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* Ed. J.-M. Durand. Paris, 139–145.

Redfield, J. (1985). "Herodotus the Tourist." *CP* 80: 97–118.

Regenbogen, O. (1943). "Review of L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians.*" *Gnomon* 19: 8–26.

Richardson, N. J. (1974). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford.
Robbins, E. (1994). "Alcman's *Partheneion*: Legend and Choral Ceremony." *CQ* 44: 7–16.
Roberts, C. H. (1954). "*P. Oxy.* 2330: Ctesias, *Persica.*" *Oxyrhynchus Papyri.* xxii. London, 81–84.
Robertson, N. (1976). "The Thessalian Expedition of 480 BC" *JHS* 96: 100–120.
Rogers, K. M. (1966). *The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature.* Seattle and London.
Rolle, R. (1989). *The World of the Scythians.* London.
Röllig, W. (1969). "Nitokris von Babylon." in: *Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben* (*Festschrift Altheim*) i. Eds. R. Stiehl and H. E. Stier. Berlin, 127–135.
Rollinger, R. (1993). *Herodots Babylonischer Logos.* Innsbruck.
Romm, J. S. (1992). *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought.* Princeton.
Rosaldo, M. Z. (1974). "Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview." in: *Woman, Culture, and Society* Eds. M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere. Stanford, 17–42.
Rose, V. (1864). *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina.* i. Berlin.
Rosellini, M. and S. Saïd (1978). "Usages de femmes et autres nomoi chez les 'sauvages' d'Hérodote: Essai de lecture structurale." *ASNP* 8: 949–1005.
Rudd, N. (1990). "Dido's *Culpa.*" in: *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* Ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford, 145–166.
Sack, R. A. (1991). *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend.* Cranbury, New Jersey.
Saïd, S. (1980–81). "Guerre, intelligence et courage dans les Histoires d'Hérodote." *Ancient Society* 11–12: 83–117.
Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1985). "The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as a Source for Iranian History." *Acta Iranica* 25: 459–471.
—— (1988a). "Περσικὸν δὲ κάρτα ὁ στρατὸς δῶρον: A Typically Persian Gift (Hdt. IX 109)." *Historia* 37: 372–374.
—— (1988b). "Was there ever a Median Empire?" in: *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory* Eds. A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Leiden, 197–212.
—— (1989). "The Personality of Xerxes, King of Kings." in: *Archaeologia iranica et orientalis. Miscellanea in honorem L. Vanden Berghe.* i. Ghent, 549–561.
—— (1993). "Exit Atossa: Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia." in: *Images of Women in Antiquity*[2] Eds. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt. London, 20–33, 303.
—— (1994). "The Orality of Herodotus' *Medikos Logos* or: the Median Empire Revisited." in: *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt and M. C. Root. Leiden, 39–55.
Schaps, D. (1982). "The Women of Greece in Wartime." *CP* 77: 193–213.
Scheid, J. and J. Svenbro (1985). "Byrsa. La ruse d'Elissa et la fondation de Carthage." *Annales ESC* 40: 328–342.
Schindler, F. (1973). *Die Überlieferung der Strategemata des Polyainos.* Vienna.
Schmidt, K. H. (1957). "Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen." *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 26: 33–301.
Schmitt, R. (1979). "Die Wiedergabe iranischer Namen bei Ktesias von Knidos im Vergleich zur sonstigen griechischen Überlieferung." in: *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia* Ed. J. Harmatta. Budapest, 119–133.
—— (1988). "Achaimenideninschriften in griechischer literarischer Überlieferung." in: *A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of J. P. Asmussen* Eds. W. Sundermann, J. Duchesne-Guillemin and F. Vahman. Leiden, 17–38.
—— (1989). "Atossa." *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3: 13–14.
Schramm, W. (1972). "War Semiramis Assyrische Regentin?" *Historia* 21: 513–521.
Schwartz, E. (1943). *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman.*[2] Berlin.

Seux, M.-J. (1980–83). "Königtum." *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6: 140–173.
Shapiro, H. A. (1983). "Amazons, Thracians, and Scythians." *GRBS* 24: 105–114.
Shapiro, S. O. (1994). "Learning through Suffering: Human Wisdom in Herodotus." *CJ* 89: 349–355.
Slater, P. E. (1968). *The Glory of Hera*. Boston.
Snyder, J. M. (1989). *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*. Bristol.
Sommerstein, A. H. (1987). *Aristophanes: Birds*. Warminster.
Stadter, P. A. (1965). *Plutarch's Historical Methods: An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes*. Cambridge, Mass.
Stähelin, F. (1907). *Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater.*[2] Leipzig.
Stahl, H.-P. (1975). "Learning through Suffering? Croesus' Conversations in the History of Herodotus." *YCS* 24: 1–36.
Stanford, W. (1961). *The Odyssey of Homer i: Books I–XII.*[2] London.
Starr, I. (1990). *Queries to the Sungod: Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria*. Helsinki.
Steiner, D. T. (1994). *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
Stephens, S. A. and J. J. Winkler (1995). *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*. Princeton.
Sulimirski, T. (1985). "The Scyths." in: *Cambridge History of Iran ii: Median and Achaemenian Periods* Ed. I. Gershevitch. Cambridge, 149–199.
Sykutris, J. (1931). "Epistolographie." *RE* Suppl. v: 185–220.
Taaffe, L. K. (1993). *Aristophanes and Women*. London.
Tadmor, H. (1973). "The Historical Inscriptions of Adad-nirari III." *Iraq* 35: 141–150.
Tarn, W. W. (1913). *Antigonos Gonatas*. Oxford.
Tarrant, D. (1928). *The Hippias Major Attributed to Plato*. Cambridge.
Taylor, A. E. (1934). "Aeschines of Sphettus." in: *Philosophical Studies*. London, 1–27.
Thalmann, W. G. (1984). *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore and London.
Thornton, A. (1970). *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey*. London.
Thrige, J. P. (1940). *Res Cyrenensium.*[3] Rome.
Tierney, J. J. (1960). "The Celtic Ethnography of Poseidonius." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 60C, 5: 189–275.
Toher, M. (1989). "On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments." *CA* 8: 159–172.
Toohey, P. (1992). *Reading Epic: An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives*. London and New York.
Tourraix, A. (1990). "Artémise d'Halicarnasse chez Hérodote ou la figure de l'ambivalence." in: *Mélanges P. Lévêque*. v. Eds. M. M. Mactoux and E. Geny. Paris, 377–385.
Troy, L. (1986). *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*. Uppsala.
Tuplin, C. (1989). "The Coinage of Aryandes." *REA* 91: 61–83.
—— (1994). "Persians as Medes." in: *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change* Eds. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt and M. C. Root. Leiden, 235–256.
Tyldesley, J. A. (1994). *Daughters of Isis: Women of Ancient Egypt*. London.
Tyrrell, W. B. (1984). *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*. Baltimore and London.
van den Hout, M. (1949). "Studies in Early Greek Letter-Writing." *Mnemosyne* 2: 1941, 19–41, 138–153.
van Hooff, A. J. L. (1990). *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity*. London.
Vandiver, E. (1991). *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History*. Frankfurt am Main.
Vernant, J.-P. (1981). "The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod." in: *Myth, Religion and Society* Ed. R. L. Gordon. Cambridge, 43–56.

—— (1983). "Hestia-Hermes: The Religious Expression of Space and Movement in Ancient Greece." in: *Myth and Thought among the Greeks.* London and Boston, 127–175.
—— (1988). "The Lame Tyrant: From Oedipus to Periander." in: J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece.* New York, 207–236, 466–472.
Vidal-Nacquet, P. (1981). "Slavery and the Rule of Women in Tradition, Myth, and Utopia." in: *Myth, Religion, and Society* Ed. R. L. Gordon. Cambridge, 187–200, 262–265.
Visser, M. (1986). "Medea: daughter, sister, wife and mother. Natal family versus conjugal family in Greek and Roman myths about women." in: *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher* Eds. M. Cropp, E. Fantham and S. E. Scully. Calgary, 149–165.
Vogelsang, W. J. (1992). *The Rise and Organisation of the Achaemenid Empire.* Leiden.
Vogt, J. (1960). "Von der Gleichwertigkeit der Geschlechter in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft der Griechen." *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz* 2: 213–255.
von Fritz, K. (1967). *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung.* i. 1–2. Berlin.
von Gutschmid, A. (1890). *Kleine Schriften.* ii. Leipzig
Waddell, W. G. (1940). *Manetho.* Cambridge, Mass. and London, Loeb Classical Library.
Walbank, F. W. (1967). *A Historical Commentary on Polybius.* ii. Oxford.
Walcot, P. (1991). "On Widows and their Reputation in Antiquity." *Symbolae Osloenses* 66: 5–26.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1982). "Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King." *JRS* 72: 32–48.
Warmington, B. H. (1964). *Carthage.* Harmondsworth.
Waters, K. H. (1985). *Herodotos the Historian.* London and Sydney.
Wehrli, F. (1957–1959). *Die Schule des Aristoteles.* ix–x. Basel and Stuttgart.
Weidner, E. (1954–56). "Hof- und Harems-Erlasse assyrischer Könige aus dem 2. Jhrt. v. Chr." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17: 257–293.
Weil, R. (1976). "Artémise ou le monde à l'envers." in: *Recueil Plassart.* Paris, 215–224.
Weinfeld, M. (1991). "Semiramis: Her Name and her Origin." in: *Ah, Assyria...: Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* Eds. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al. Jerusalem, 99–103.
Weisgerber, L. (1931). "Galatische Sprachreste." in: *Natalicium Johannes Geffcken.* Heidelberg, 151–175.
Weissbach, F. H. (1924). "Kyros." *RE* Suppl. iv: 1129–1166.
West, G. S. (1975). Women in Virgil's Aeneid. Diss. University of California, Los Angeles.
West, M. L. (1966). *Hesiod, Theogony.* Oxford.
—— (1985). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women.* Oxford
West, S. (1985). "Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests." *CQ* 35: 278–305.
—— (1988). "The Scythian ultimatum (Herodotus iv 131, 132)." *JHS* 108: 207–211.
Westenholz, J. G. (1990). "Towards a New Conceptualization of the Female Role in Mesopotamian Society." *JAOS* 110: 510–521.
Westermann, A. (1839). ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ: *Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci.* Brunswick and London; repr. Amsterdam 1963.
Westlake, H. D. (1936). "The Medism of Thessaly." *JHS* 56: 12–24.
Wheeler, E. L. (1984). "Sophistic Interpretations and Greek Treaties." *GRBS* 25: 253–274.
Wicker, K. O. (1978). "Mulierum Virtutes (*Moralia* 242E–263C)." in: *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* Ed. H. D. Betz. Leiden, 106–134.

Wiedemann, T. E. J. (1983). "ἐλάχιστον ... ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος: Thucydides, Women, and the Limits of Rational Analysis." *G&R* 30: 163–170.
Wilson, N. G. (1983). *Scholars of Byzantium.* London and Baltimore.
—— (1994). *Photius, The Bibliotheca.* London.
Wiseman, D. J. (1985). *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon.* Oxford.
Young, T. C. (1988). "The Medes and the earliest Persians." in: *Cambridge Ancient History* iv.[2] Eds. J. Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis and M. Ostwald. Cambridge, 6–23.
Zeitlin, F. (1978). "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*." *Arethusa* 11: 149–184. Reprinted in Peradotto and Sullivan 1984.
Ziegler, K. (1937). "Tomyris." *RE* vi A2: 1702–1704.
—— (1964). *Plutarchos von Chaironeia.* Stuttgart.

INDEX LOCORUM

Bold numbers indicate a main entry. Passages appearing more than once on the same page are cited only once in the index.

Abydenus:
FGrH 685
F6 112, 113

Aelian:
De Natura Animalium
4. 2 72
12. 31 124
Varia Historia
12. 39 79
13. 3 116–117

Aeneas Tacticus:
37. 6 164

Aeschines Socraticus:
Aspasia
fr. 18 D. 28, **151–158**
fr. 20 D. 183
fr. 21 D. 28, **179–186**
fr. 22 D. 152, 179
frr. 23–24 D. 183
frr. 26–27 D. 183

Aeschylus:
Choephoroi
585–652 51–52
Prometheus Vinctus
415–419 89
723–724 154
Septem contra Thebas
181–202 25

Alcman:
Partheneion
64–77 44–45

Alexis:
frr. 42–43 24

Ambrosius:
Epistulae
18. 36 187, 203

Ammianus Marcellinus:
15. 12. 1 222
23. 6. 7 187, 198, 202
27. 4. 4 219

Ampelius:
Liber Memorialis
13. 1 187, 202

Amphis:
fr. 8 24

Anthologia Palatina:
16. 51 126

Apollodorus:
Bibliotheca
2. 6. 3 161
2. 8. 2 125

Apollonius:
Historiae Mirabiles
7–51 38
151 159

Appian:
Libyca
1 130
1–2 126, 132
Syriaca
67–68 157

Aristodemus:
FGrH 104
F1. 1 205, 208, 210

Aristophanes:
Birds
829–831 21
Ecclesiazusae
210–212 24
233–235 24
241–246 23
427 ff. 24
491 23
583 ff. 24
597–600 24
Lysistrata
452 ff. 24
520 21

538 21
567 ff. 21
672–681 58
675 + Σ 205, 208, 210, 218
1108–1109 23
1124–1127 23
Thesmophoriazusae
1200 205, 218

Aristotle:
Politics
1269b24–27 221
1269b30 ff. 25
1311a36 ff. 33
fr. 611. 16 R. 164, 167–168
fr. 611. 17 R. 173

Arrian:
Anabasis
6. 24. 2–3 81
6. 29 115

Athenaeus:
150d–f 224
184b–c 164
515f–516c 161
560b–f 46
571e ff. 46
583d–e 46
603a 221

Berossus:
FGrH 680
F2 77
F5. 25 65, 66, 69
F7d 113
F8 65, 66, 113
F10 203

Caesar:
Bellum Gallicum
6. 22 224
6. 23 223

Callicrates-Menecles:
FGrH 370
F2 175
F4a 175

Castor:
FGrH 250
F1d 141

Cephalion:
FGrH 93
F1 75

Charon of Lampsacus
FGrH 262
F17 196

Claudian:
In Eutropium
1. 339–342 75, 141, 147

Conon:
FGrH 26
F9 141

I Corinthians:
7:9 134

Ctesias:
FGrH 688
T11 95
T13 95
T14 95
F1a-F1n **65–83**
F1b **65–83,** 92, 94, 112, 115, 137, 145, 148
F1c 28, **65–83**
F1n 148
F1o β 142
F1p 82, 148
F1q 82, 137
F5 68, **84–100**, 92
F7 28, **84–100**
F8a–b **84–100**
F9 85, 86, 94, 199, 203
F13 85, 116–117, 157
F14 93, 96, 157
F15 143
F17 96

Curtius Rufus:
5. 1. 35 78, 113

Deinon:
FGrH 690
F7 65, 67

Demetrius:
De Elocutione
213 84, 89, 92–93, 95, 97

Dio Cassius:
62. 2 223
62. 6 101
79. 23 65, 103

Dio Chrysostomus:
21. 7 157
64. 2 65

Diodorus Siculus:
1. 21–22 128
1. 64. 14 102
2. 1–34 **65–83**
2. 2. 3 86
2. 5. 1–2 85
2. 6. 5 85
2. 7. 2 85
2. 10. 1 78, 113
2. 11. 1 85
2. 20. 3–5 76
2. 33. 1–6 92
2. 34. 1–5 84–85, 86, 89, 93, 95, 99
2. 43. 5 187
2. 44. 1–2 187, 188, 202, 203
2. 46 85
3. 53 21, 200
4. 28. 3–4 94
5. 32. 1 219
5. 32. 3 222
5. 32. 7 221
5. 34. 3 223
8. 29–30 175
11. 19 216
11. 22 137
13. 57. 3–5 131
13. 86. 3 138
13. 108. 4 131
14. 73 137
14. 76. 3–4 131
20. 14. 4–7 138
20. 65. 1 138
20. 67 137

Diogenes Laertius:
3. 46 146
6. 96–98 21
7. 34 146

Diogenianus Paroemiographus:
1. 83 121

Dionysius of Halicarnassus:
Antiquitates Romanae
1. 74. 1 130

Dissoi Logoi:
DK 90
2. 17 21

Eratosthenes(?)
FGrH 610
F1 κβ 101, 103

Etymologicum Magnum:
s.v. Δειδῶ 139
s.v. Θαργηλία 179

Euripides:
Andromache
364–365 23
Bacchae
118 21
1236 21
Hippolytus
638–644 23
Medea
292 ff. 23
Orestes
1204–1205 23
Supplices
293–294 23
frr. 483–484 23
fr. 522 21

Eusebius:
Chronica
583 141

Eustathius:
Comm. in Dionysium Periegetam
195 126, 130, 132, 139

Frontinus:
Strategemata
2. 5. 5 187, 197, 198, 202

Harpocration:
s.v. Ἀρτεμισία 205

Hellanicus:
FGrH 4
F63 82
F71b–c 144
F166–167 144
F167c 17, 154
F175 144
F177 141
F178a 28, **141–150**
F178b–c 141, 147, 148
F189 144

Hermippus of Smyrna:
frr. 89–91 W. 33

Herodotus:

Book 1

1. 7 — 73
1. 8–12 — 55, 57, 161
1. 16–22 — 159, 162
1. 25 — 159, 162
1. 60 — 214
1. 66 — 190
1. 71 — 145, 193
1. 74 — 113
1. 77 — 113
1. 82 — 153
1. 93 — 115
1. 95 ff. — 142
1. 99–100 — 149
1. 103–106 — 87
1. 105 — 72, 91
1. 106 — 196
1. 129 — 122
1. 135 — 145
1. 155 — 146
1. 183 — 116
1. 184 — 65, 68, 107, 109
1. 185 — 190
1. 185–187 — 28, **106–120**
1. 188 — 113
1. 189 — 110
1. 190 — 190
1. 191 — 111
1. 201 — 187, 190
1. 203 — 188
1. 204–216 — 28, **187–204**
1. 211 — 104
1. 212 — 119

Book 2

2. 35 — 21
2. 99–142 — 101
2. 99 — 110
2. 100 — 28, **101–105**, 106
2. 101 — 110
2. 107 — 104, 125
2. 121 δ — 196
2. 124 — 103
2. 125 — 115
2. 127 — 103
2. 134–135 — 102, 184
2. 150 — 73, 112

Book 3

3. 4 — 202
3. 11 — 202
3. 13 — 168
3. 20–22 — 195, 212
3. 21 — 190
3. 22 — 196
3. 23 — 212
3. 25 — 191
3. 48 — 171
3. 48–53 — 167
3. 60 — 110
3. 61–77 — 149
3. 81 — 122
3. 88 — 116
3. 89 — 116
3. 92 — 147
3. 101 — 188
3. 119 — 125
3. 130 — 212
3. 134 — 184
3. 142 — 122
3. 153–160 — 210
3. 155 — 117

Book 4

4. 1 — 190
4. 11 — 187
4. 43 — 184
4. 64–66 — 202
4. 67 — 91
4. 76 — 198
4. 78 — 198
4. 87 — 116
4. 91 — 116
4. 110–117 — 90, 201
4. 131–132 — 212
4. 134 — 191
4. 145 — 169
4. 147 — 121, 123, 124
4. 160 — 175
4. 160–161 — 165
4. 162 — 212
4. 162–167 — **164–178**
4. 180 — 188, 214
4. 196 — 131
4. 200–205 — **164–178**
4. 205 — 104

Book 5

5. 18–20 — 104
5. 24 — 119
5. 39 — 125
5. 48 — 142
5. 49 — 145
5. 51 — 142
5. 67 — 142
5. 92 — 167

Book 6

6. 52 — 28, **121–125**

6. 53–54 123
6. 61 125
Book 7
7. 6 182
7. 18 190
7. 24 110
7. 25 110
7. 27–29 185, 212
7. 33–37 110
7. 38–39 185
7. 39 169
7. 61 145
7. 64 85
7. 69 84
7. 82 190
7. 89 214
7. 96 206, 214
7. 99 28, 205, 206, 207, 211, 213
7. 107 137
7. 114 169
7. 130 182
7. 167 137
7. 172–174 182
7. 208–209 152
7. 210 209
Book 8
8. 10 213
8. 17 213
8. 68 28, 205, 208, 209, 215
8. 69 207, 215
8. 84 209
8. 85 213
8. 86 215
8. 87–88 28, 205, 208, 211
8. 90 214
8. 93 28, 205, 208, 209
8. 101–102 28, 205, 207, 216
8. 103 207, 216
8. 103–106 216
8. 108 190
8. 118 212
Book 9
9. 1 182, 185
9. 20 209
9. 58 182
9. 80 214
9. 107 209
9. 108–112 184
9. 109 146, 214
9. 112 169

Hesiod:
Theogony
75–79 43
240–264 42
337–370 42
349–361 44
570–616 48
886–923 46
938–944 46
Works and Days
53–105 48

[Hesiod]:
Catalogue of Women
fr. 43a 48
frr. 72–76 47
fr. 193 47
fr. 195 47

Hesychius
s.v. θαργηλία 179, 181

Hippias:
FGrH 6 (= DK 86)
F3 (= B4) 28, 179–180
F4 (= B6) 180

[Hippocrates]:
Airs, Waters, Places
17 90, 200
22 91, 145
Epistulae
27. 5 205, 217

Homer:
Iliad
3. 125–128 20
3. 189 93
5. 677–678 43
6. 186 93
6. 490–493 20
7. 236 20
11. 57–60 43
12. 193 43
13. 790–792 43
14. 315–328 46
16. 415–417 43
18. 39–49 41
22. 440–448 21
Odyssey
1. 356–359 20
2. 116–118 20
7. 108–111 20

11. 225–330 **48–50**
11. 441 ff. 50
14. 288–297 131
15. 415–416 131
21. 350–353 20
24. 55–59 41

Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*:
1–21 43
5 44
6–8 44
105–110 44
149–155 44
174–179 44
405–433 43
418–424 43
425–428 44
473–476 44

Hyginus:
Fabulae
223 65
240 65
242 53
243 53, 65, 83
275 65

Iamblichus:
De Vita Pythagorica
267 45

Ion of Chios:
FGrH 392
F13 214

Isocrates:
Panathenaicus
193 94
Panegyricus
68 89

Jerome:
Against Jovinian
1. 41–49 54–55
1. 43 126, 130, 134, 135, 136
1. 45 151, 157, 163

Josephus:
Antiquities
8. 144 130
Contra Apionem
1. 125 130

Judith:
16:21, 23 15

Julian:
Orationes
3. 127a–c 35, 58
3. 127a 65
3. 127 b 103

Justin:
1. 1–2 65
1. 1. 9 75
1. 2. 1 ff. 141
1. 2. 6 144, 148
1. 2. 10–11 82
1. 8 187, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204
2. 12. 23–24 205, 208, 210
11. 10. 13 127
18. 4. 1–18. 6. 8 **126–140**
24. 4. 1 219, 223

Juvenal:
Satires
6. 246–267 52
6. 434–456 52

Livy:
5. 34. 2, 9 223

Lucian:
Charon
13 187, 188, 198, 202, 203, 204
De Dea Syria
14 65, 71
33 65, 71
39–40 71
Dialogi Deorum
15. 2 161
Eunuchus
7 179, 181
Hesiodus
1 48
Pseudologista
25 73

Lysias:
2. 4 25

Macrobius:
Somnium Scipionis
2. 10. 7 77, 141

Manetho:
FGrH 609

F2 101, 102
F3a–b 101, 102

Memnon:
FGrH 434
F8. 8 219

Menander of Ephesus:
FGrH 783
F1 126, 127, 128, 129–130

Menecles:
FGrH 270
F5 28, **164–178**
F6 164–165
F8 175
F9 164

Neanthes of Cyzicus:
FGrH 84
F13 33

Nicolaus of Damascus:
FGrH 90
F1 65, 67, 82, 83
F4 92
F5 84, 88, 89, 93, 96, 97–98
F22 160
F44 124
F50 175
F63 159, 160
F64 159
F65 162
F66 196

Onesicritus:
FGrH 134
F36 203

Orosius:
Historia adversus paganos
2. 7 187, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204

Ovid:
Ars Amatoria
1. 279–342 52
Fasti
3. 523–696 129

P. Oxy.
441 34
2330 84, 97

Pausanias:
1. 2. 1 94
1. 4. 1 219
2. 20. 8 156
3. 1. 5–9 121
3. 11. 3 205, 210
3. 16. 6 124

Persian Inscriptions:
DB I §§10–14 149
DB IV §§56, 60–61, 65 116

Pherecrates
frr. 150–154 24

Philochorus:
FGrH 328
T1 45

Philostratus:
Epistulae
73 152, 179, 180
Imagines
2. 5 **151–158**

Phocylides:
fr. 2 D. 51

Photius:
codex 161, 103a–104b 33–34
codex 175, 119b 60
codex 190, 153a 205, 217–218

Pindar:
Pythian
9. 19–22 21
Σ ad *Ol.* 2. 76d, 81a–b 123

Plato:
Alcibiades I
126e–127a 21
Hippias Maior
281a 181
Laws
694c–695b 82
804d–806c 26
804e–805a 90
806b 25
813c–814c 26
Menexenus
235e 183
Republic
451b–457c 25

454b–457b 26
455c 21
460b 25
473c 25

[Plato]:
Minos
315b 138

Pliny:
Naturalis Historia
5. 81 71
8. 155 83
35. 78 76
36. 82 102

Plutarch:
Alexander
6. 29 115
Artaxerxes
27. 4 157
Camillus
15 219
Moralia
173b 106, 107, 118
243c 35, 65
243d 34, 35
245c–f 57, 156
246b–d 222
253f 30
255e–257e 15
257e–258f 222
258d–f 220
260e 166–167
260e–261d 176
261d 166
305a–316b 38–39
753d–e 76
785e 161
869f–870a 205, 207, 216
Pericles
24 179, 181
Themistocles
14. 3 205, 217
Theseus
5 152
28. 4 94
Timoleon
29 131

Polyaenus:
Strategemata
7. 2 162
7. 23 217
7. 28 169
7. 34 164, 177
8. 26 37, 65, 79, 151, 155
8. 27 37, 151, 155
8. 28 37, 187, 188, 196, 197, 198, 202
8. 41 176
8. 47 37, 164, 173, 176–177
8. 53 37, 205, 208, 209, 210, 213, 214, 216–217

Polybius:
12. 28–29a 127
38. 20. 7–10 135

Posidonius:
fr. 67 E.-K. 224
fr. 68 E.-K. 224
fr. 240a E.-K. 219

Proclus:
Chrestomathia
175–180 93

Propertius:
3. 19 52

Quintus Smyrnaeus:
1. 654–674 93
1. 718–721 93

Scamon of Mytilene:
FGrH 476
F3 144

Semonides:
fr. 7 W. 51

Servius:
ad *Aen.* 1. 267 126
ad *Aen.* 1. 343 127, 128
ad *Aen.* 4. 36 139
ad *Aen.* 4. 656 131
ad *Aen.* 4. 682 129
ad *Aen.* 5. 4 129

Servius Daniel:
ad *Aen.* 4. 9 129

Sidonius Apollinaris:
Carmina
9. 30–37 187, 197, 198, 202, 203, 204

Silius Italicus:
Punica
1. 21–23 128
4. 765 ff. 138
8. 39–201 129

Simonides:
PMG 510 182
PMG 528 182

Sophocles:
Oedipus Coloneus
339–341 21
fr. 122 N. 138
fr. 823 N. 131

Stephanus Byzantius:
Ethnica
s.v. Μασσαγέται 187

Stobaeus:
10. 53 106, 118

Strabo:
4. 4. 3 221
11. 5. 3 17
11. 6. 2 90, 187, 188
11. 8. 2 187
11. 8. 5–6 77, 187, 188, 196, 197
11. 8. 8 187
11. 13. 9 145, 146
15. 1. 5–6 81
15. 2. 5 81
15. 3. 7 115
16. 4. 27 71
17. 1. 33 102

Suda:
s.v. Ἀλυάττης 159, 162
s.v. Ἀρτεμισία 205, 208, 210
s.v. Ἑλλάνικος 144
s.v. ἐμπεδορκεῖν 164, 174–175
s.v. ἐπεφόρησε 164, 174–175
s.v. εὐλαί 164, 175
s.v. Ἡρόδοτος 205
s.v. Θαργηλία 179, 185
s.v. Παμφίλη 60
s.v. Ῥοδογούνη 157
s.v. Σεμίραμις 65, 81
s.v. Στρυγγαῖος 84
s.v. Τόμυρις 187, 188
s.v. Χάρων 33

Suetonius:
Nero
31–32 130

Tacitus:
Agricola
16. 1 222
Annales
12. 40 222
14. 34 222
14. 35 222
16. 1 130
Germania
7–8 222
Historia
3. 45 222

Tertullian:
De Monogamia
17 134

Theon:
Progymnasmata
9 58, 65, 75, 187, 188, 198, 200, 218

Theophrastus:
frr. 625–627 46

Theopompus Comicus:
frr. 55–59 24

Theopompus Historicus:
FGrH 115
F64–77 32
F85–100 32

Thucydides:
1. 73 206
1. 130 149
2. 4 25
3. 26 206
3. 74 25
4. 29 206
5. 27 206

[Tibullus]:
4. 1. 143 187

Timaeus:
FGrH 566
T19 127, 136
F7 127
F60 130
F82 28, **126–140**
F106 131
F112 137

Tzetzes:
Chiliades
12. 893–898 84, 89, 92

Valerius Maximus:
9. 3 ext. 4 151, 154
9. 10 ext. 1 187, 198, 199, 202–203, 204

Virgil:
Aeneid
1. 338–368 126
1. 343–359 128
1. 359 130
1. 364 139
1. 365–368 132
1. 441–445 132
1. 619–623 127
4. 20–21 126, 128
4. 35–38 126
4. 198–218 132
4. 211–212 132, 139
4. 323–326 135
4. 421–423 129
4. 655–656 126
6. 440 ff. 52–53

Xanthus of Lydia:
FGrH 765
F4 161
F17 70
F18 159, 160
F22 159

Xenophilus
FGrH 767
F1 28, **159–163**

Xenophon:
Anabasis
1. 2. 27 214
1. 5. 8 145, 152, 214
2. 5. 23 145
Cyropaedia
5. 1. 6–7 93
8. 2. 8 214
8. 7. 2 ff. 203
Hellenica
3. 1. 10 ff. 57
Lacedaemonion Politeia
11. 3 152
Symposium
2. 9 3

GENERAL INDEX

Bold numbers indicate a main entry.

Adad-Guppi 14, 108–109
ADM (anonymous author)
  adapts sources 19–20, 98–99, 104, 110, 118–119, 122, 180, 190, 192, 196, 208, 211–212
  accuracy 31, 98, 104, 118–119, 152, 211–212, 218
  cites sources 3, 27, 29, 37–38, 179, 181, 219–220
  as compiler 11, 19, 30–31, 56–57, 67–68, 84, 97–100, 140, 154, 157, 164, 165, 172, 178, 183, 185–186, 204, 218
  on gender roles 19–20
  identity of 58–61
  ignores beauty 18, 55, 58, 183, 223
  see also DM
advisers, wise 191, 192–195, 207
Aeneas 126, 129
Aeschines the Socratic *Aspasia* 3, 8, 19, 28, 29, 151, 179–180, 183
Alcman, *Partheneion* 44–45
Aleuads 182–183, 185
Alexander and Semiramis 80–81
Alyattes 8–9, 160, 162
Amazons 17–18, 21, 25, 26, 58, 60, 89–90, 93–95, 153–154, 157, 159, 200–201
Ameinias 208–209
Amestris 169–170
Anarieis, *see* Enarees
Andromache 20–21
Anna 129, 136
Antiochus of Thessaly 9, 179, 181–182
Antoninus Liberalis 39
Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, epitome of 27
Araxes 189–191, 203
Arcesilaus III 9, 165, 166–167, 168, 170–171, 173, 177
Aretaphilia 15
Argeia **7**, **121–125**
  deceives 22, 121, 125
  genealogy 123
  and twins 16, 121–122, 123–124
Ariaspes 8, 142–143
aristeia 213–214
Aristodemus 7, 121, 124
Aristophanes, *see* gender roles
armor 20, 21, 212–214
Artemisia 3, **10**, 12, 13, 55, 58, **204–218**
  advises 22, 207
  background 205–206
  brave? 208–211, 217
  contradictory qualities 205, 206, 209–210, 216, 218
  deceives 22, 208–211
  escorts children 216
  and gender roles 19–20, 208–209, 212–214
  and lover 217–218
  and son 15, 16, 199, 206–207
  and Themistocles 218
  at war 16, 208–211
Artemon of Magnesia 34
Aryandes 9, 168, 171, 177
Aspasia 180, 181, 183–184
Assyrian 11, 66–69, 74, 77, 87, 107, 141, 146
  see also Syrian
Astibaras 86–88, 98
Athena 20, 21, 142, 162, 214
Atossa **8**, 11, 12, **141–150**, 158
  clothing of 19, 75, 92, 145–146
  no emotional ties 16, 147–148
  and eunuchs 146–148, 150
  hides gender 19, 22, 143–144, 146–147, 149, 150
  nationality 11, 141
  and Semiramis 66, 75, 141–142, 144, 146, 147
  at war 16, 144, 150
  and writing 148–149

Babylon 6, 7, 11, 74, 78–79, 107, 108–113, 117–118
Babylonian practices 68, 109, 114–115, 118, 147

Bactra 6, 74–75
Barca 164–178
Battiads, *see* Arcesilaus, Eryxo, Pheretime
beauty, female 18, 36, 42, 47, 49, 55, 77, 84, 85, 93, 102
Behistun 79–80, 115, 116
Bel 6, 68, 116–117, 127
Berossus 66, 69
brief biographies 32–37
brother-sister marriage 85–86, 103, 128–129, 160
Boadicea 65, 222–223

Callimachus 32, 38, 159
Cambyses 160, 190–191, 195, 212
Candaules' wife 55, 57, 161
Carthage and Carthaginians 7, 129–130, 132, 134–135, 138
  see also Phoenicians
Cartimandua 222
catalogues, characteristics of 27, 35, 37, 38, 40–41, 55, 57
catalogues of men vs. women 42–43, 44, 45, 48, 50
catalogues of women 5, 18, 33–37, 39, **40–56**, 57
Celts, Celtic 11, 219–224
  women 221–223
  see also Galatian
Charon of Carthage 33
clothing 24, 75, 145–146
courtesans 46, 76–77, 184
  see also Aspasia
Croesus 8, 146, 159, 162, 190, 192–195
Ctesias, *Persica* 3, 6, 28, 29, 60, 66–67, 81, 84–85, 91, 97–98, 127
  on Babylon 78–79
  chronology in 68, 86–87
  duel scenes in 93–94, 96
  sensational style 95–96
  unreliable? 81, 86–88
  on women 94–95, 148, 156–157, 184
  see also Diodorus Siculus, Nicolaus of Damascus
Cyaxares 87
Cydraeus 6, 85–86, 88
Cyrene (place) 9, 164–178
Cyrene (woman) 21
Cyrus 9–10, 76, 81, 82, 115, 142
  at Babylon 108, 110–111
  deceives 189, 196–198
  insatiable 119, 191, 201–203
  and Tomyris 187–204
  and warrior queens 89, 94, 96, 119, 188, 199–200, 202

Darius 7, 168, 212
  daughter 157
  greed 107, 114, 116, 119, 190–191
  inscriptions 79–80, 115–116
  Zoroastrianism 118
daughters as heirs 142–143, 150
De Mulieribus (*DM*)
  as catalogue 26–27, 30, 54, 55–56
  brevity and ambiguity 135, 140, 171, 173, 174, 178, 210, 218, 224
  content of notices 27–28, 29
  date 29–30, 32, 219–220
  ending 29, 30, 220, 224
  format 26–27, 57
  genre 32–39
  language 27–28, 122, 204, 211
  mss. 5–6
  order of notices 30
  and Polyaenus 37, 155, 173
  sources 27–28, 57
  style 26, 27–28
  title 3–4, 16, 33
  unique information 77, 100, 224
  see also ADM, women of *DM*
deceptions 22, 103–104, 114–115, 121, 125, 130–134, 174–175, 196–198, 208–211
Deioces 114, 149
Derceto 6, 70–72
Dido **7–8**, 13, **126–140**
  in catalogues 54–55, 126, 134, 177
  chaste 54, 55, 134, 135–136
  deceives 131–132, 133–134, 136, 139
  family ties 16, 128–129
  founds colony 16, 55, 129–130, 132, 137
  and gold 130–131, 135, 137
  husband 128, 129, 131, 134, 135, 140
  names 127, 138–139
  suicide 22, 133–138, 139–140
  vengeance 131, 137
  in Virgil 53, 126, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136

Diodorus Siculus
and Ctesias 66, 84–85, 89, 91–92, 98
women in 84–85
distant rulers 148, 149, 150
doves 70–72

Egypt, Egyptians 7, 9, 11, 21, 101, 103, 147, 170
Elissa, *see* Dido
Enarees 91, 145
Ephorus 216, 220
Eryphile 49, 50, 52, 54
Eryxo 166, 167, 175–176
Ethiopian king 190–191, 195, 212
eunuchs 143–144, 146–148, 216
Euripides, *see* gender roles
exempla literature 5, 32, 35–36, 38, 50, 52, 58, 60, 65, 180, 181

fatal feast 103–104, 196, 197
foundling motif 70–71, 76

Galatians 10–11, 219, 222
gender, indeterminate 19, 75, 92, 101, 144, 145–146, 147
gender roles 19–21, 23–24, 208–209, 212–214, 221
in Aristophanes 21, 23–24
in comedy 24
in Euripides 21, 23
in Homer 20–21
in Plutarch 35–36
in Thucydides 25
see also Plato
genealogical catalogues 46–48, 49–50
gifts 195, 196, 212–214, 223–224
goddesses 13, 54, 70–72, 79, 128, 137–138, 139, 223
Gyges 159, 160, 161

Halicarnassus 10, 205–206, 211
Hasdrubal's wife 135
Hellanicus 8, 19, 28, 29, 45, 141, 144, 181
Heracles 146, 161
Hermippus of Smyrna 32–33
Herodotus 3, 7, 9, 10, 19, 28, 29, 57, 85, 210, 212, 213
Assyrioi logoi 68, 107
on land and sea 110–111, 189–190
on Medes 87–88
moralizes 170, 189–190, 191
on tyrants 114–115, 167, 169
women in 90, 94–95, 107, 112, 125, 156–157, 169–170, 184
Hesiod, catalogues in 18, 40–43, 46
Hesiodic
Catalogue of Women 47–48
Hippias 28, 32, 179, 180–181
Hippolyte 94
Homer, catalogues in 18, 40–43, 46–47, 48–50, 53
horses 83, 90, 91, 132, 214
hostages 96, 199–200
human sacrifice 138
Hymn to Demeter 43–44

Iarbas 132–134
inscriptions 79–80, 109, 112, 113–116, 155
intelligent women 22–24, 36, 60
Ishtar 72, 81
Ishtar gate 117–118
Istrus 38

Jerome 54–55, 134, 135, 157
jewelry 152, 214
Judith 15, 59
Juvenal 52

kingdom as dowry 88, 189

letters, women's 148–149
Libya 7–8, 9
see also Barca, Cyrene
Lyde **8–9**, **159–163**, 207
brother-husband 86, 160
gentle 18, 160–161, 162–163
queen mother 160–161
and son 16
see also Alyattes
Lydians 11, 159–163, 193
Lygdamis 10, 205, 206
Lysistrata 21, 23

male pride 194, 209
marriage and war 89–90, 94–95
marvels, *see* paradoxographical writings
Massagetae 9, 11, 187–189, 190, 193, 201
Medes and Persians 88–89, 145, 146
Median history 86–87, 91–92, 99
Menander of Ephesus 127, 128, 129–130
Menecles 9, 28, 29, 164–165, 170–175, 176, 177, 178

Mermerus 6, 88, 93, 96–97
misogynist writings 48, 50, 51–52, 56
Musonius Rufus 69
mutilation 169

Nabonides, *see* Nitocris the Babylonian
Nanarus and Parsondes 91–92
Naqi'a 14, 108
narrowly defined groups 32–33
Neanthes of Cyzicus 33
Near East, (royal) women of 11–12, 14, 15, 108–109, 143
Nebuchadnezzar, *see* Nitocris the Babylonian
Nereids 41–43
Nicolaus of Damascus 30
  and Ctesias 88, 91–92, 96, 97–98
  and Xenophilus 159, 160
Ninus 6, 14, 72–76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 141
Ninyas 6, 77, 82, 148, 207
Nitocris the Babylonian **7**, 12, **106–120**
  admirable? 110–111, 115, 119–120
  building works 16, 107, 108, 109–113
  deceives 22, 106, 114–115
  identity of 106, 108–109, 113
  inscription 113–115
  and Nabonidus 16, 108, 109, 113
  name 103, 106, 109, 113
  and Nebuchadnezzar 111–113
  and Semiramis 66, 107–108, 112, 141–142
  and Tomyris 119
Nitocris the Egyptian **7**, 13, **101–105**
  avenges husband 16, 102, 104
  brother-husband 86, 103
  constructs pyramid 102–103
  deceives 22, 103
  and Dido 14, 104, 129, 133
  historical queen 101
  name and namesake 103, 106
noble savages 188–189, 191, 195

Oceanids 42–44
Omphale 146, 161
Onnes 6, 14, 67, 74–76
Onomaris **10–11**, 12, 15, **219–224**
  date 219
  family 16, 221, 224
  name 220–221
  at war 16, 224
Ovid, *Heroides* 53–54

Pamphile 60–61
Panites 121–122, 125
paradoxographical writings 4, 38, 58, 67
Parthenius, *Erotica Pathemata* 39, 53
Parthians 6, 86–87, 99
Parysatis 95–96
Pausanias 149
Penelope 15, 20, 50, 53, 58
Penthesilea 93
Periander
  and Arcesilaus 167
Peripatetic writings 32–33
Persian king 6, 9, 10, 12, 16, 22, 57, 89, 95, 120, 157, 169
Persians 8, 11, 141, 145, 147, 149
Pha(e)nias 33
Pheretime **9**, 12, **164–178**, 212–213
  and Battiads 9, 165–166, 167, 173, 175–176
  cruel and vengeful 16, 166, 169–170, 171–172, 177
  date 169
  death 170, 172
  deceives 171, 174–175
  kills opponents 169–172
  Menecles' 164–165, 170–172
  perpetuates dynasty 172–173, 177
  as ruler 167–168, 172–173
  see also Arcesilaus III
philosophy, women study 21, 34, 45, 52, 60, 146, 181
Philostratus 151–152, 153
Phlegon 4
Phoenicians 7, 10, 11, 20, 126–140
  cowardly? 214–216
  greed and deception 130–133
Plato, *Republic* 5 24, 25–26, 33, 60
Plutarch
  and Herodotus 118
  Virtues of Women 3, 30, 34–36, 56, 57
Plutarchean
  De Fluviis 39
  Parallela Minora 38–39
Polyaenus' *Strategemata* 4, 36–37, 79–80, 126, 155, 173, 176–177, 216–217
Polyneices 7, 123

Praxagora 23–24, 146
priestesses 45, 223
Pygmalion 7, 127–128, 129–130, 131, 135
pyres 83, 133–138
Pythagorean women 45

queens
 Hellenistic 59
 throne names 141, 157
 word for 12, 28
queen mothers 14, 15, 108–109, 160–161, 167

Rhodogyne **8**, 12, 55, **151–158**, 180
 no emotional ties 16
 hair 18, 152–153, 155
 hates men 18, 153–154
 identity of 156–157
 and Semiramis 66, 154–155
 at war 16, 151, 158
Rhodopis 102, 158, 184
rivers 81, 107, 110, 112, 189–190, 191, 197, 220–221, 223
romantic tales 14, 39, 46–47, 53, 55
romantic triangles 75–76, 97–99, 100

Sacae, Sacians 6, 11, 85
 see also Scythian
Salamis, battle of 205, 207, 208–211, 214–216, 217
Sammuramat 14, 68–69, 109
Sandanis 193, 194
Sardanapallus 82, 112, 137, 146, 148
Sargon 70–71, 76
Sauromatae 26, 89–90, 200–201
Scythian 85, 86–88, 91, 187–188, 190–191, 212
 women 89–90, 94–95, 157, 199–200
Semiramis 4, **6**, 7, 11, 13, 14, **65–83**
 as builder 65, 77–78, 80
 in catalogues 35, 65, 177
 clothing of 74–75, 92, 145–146
 as courtesan 76–77
 deceives 22, 81
 emotional ties 14, 16
 foundling 70–71
 and Indian king 67
 and lovers 65, 67, 72, 76, 77, 83
 lustful 65, 82–83, 154
 in *Ninus* romance 59, 72–74
 origins 67
 and sons 15, 67, 72, 82, 207
 at war 16, 74–75, 81, 94
 see also Atossa, Ninus, Ninyas, Rhodogyne, Sammuramat
Semonides 50, 51
sharing property 223–224
Simmas 6, 74
Simonides 182
Smerdis 149
Socratic circle on women 24
Sopatros 34, 57
source citations 37–39
Sparethra 89, 94–95, 199–201
Spargapises 198–199
Spartans 7, 25, 45, 121–125, 153
spindles and distaffs 20, 168, 212–213
statues and stelae of women 69, 79, 84, 155–156
 see also inscriptions
Stryangaeus 6, 14, 88, 92–93, 97–99
substitute king 76–77
Suda, the 174–175
suicide 22, 53, 65, 75, 97–98, 104, 105, 133–138, 162, 198–199, 217–218
Syrian 6, 70–72

Telesilla 57, 156
Thargelia **9**, 12, 29, **179–186**
 beautiful & seductive 18, 179, 180, 185
 death 185
 enlists allies 16, 179, 184–185
 husbands 16, 179, 180, 182–183
 intelligent 181
 as ruler 182–183, 184–185
Theiosso, *see* Dido
Theophrastus, *Characters* 51
Theopompus 32
Thessaly 9, 179–183
Timaeus 3, 7, 28, 29, 126–127, 130, 220
 on Carthaginians 131, 133, 134, 137, 140
 and Justin 127, 134
tombs 77, 84, 99, 114–115, 116–118
Tomyris **9–10**, 12, 13, 88, **187–204**, 207
 deceives? 197–198
 and Ethiopian king 195–196
 historical? 203
 noble savage 195–196, 197–198
 and son 15, 16, 187, 198–201
 and Sparethra 199–201

vengeful 198, 201–203
at war 16, 94–95, 187
wise adviser 22, 191, 193, 201
see also Cyrus
twins 123–124
Tyro 49

underworld
Aeneas in 52–53
Odysseus in 48–50
unfaithful wives 49–50, 51–52, 54

war and women 20–21, 24–26, 58, 89–90, 208–209, 222
weak men 82, 91–92, 120, 147, 208–209, 221
weaving and woolworking 20–21, 213
see also spindles and distaffs
widows 13–14, 22, 82, 86, 124, 135–136, 189, 206, 223
wine 188, 194, 195–196, 198–199, 202
women of *DM* **11–18**, 143
and Amazons 17–18, 154
deceive 22, 104, 197, 210
diverse nationalities 11, 37, 56
and families 15–16, 86, 108, 200
husbands of 12–14, 124, 189, 206, 223
intelligence 22–23
and Persian king 12, 18, 88, 119–120, 179, 187
pursue power 14–15, 16, 56, 125
"real" and mortal 11, 56, 70, 137–138, 223
sons of 14, 15, 199–200, 206–207
vengeful 16, 104
as warriors 16–18
see also Amazons, beauty, deceptions, Persian king, war and women, widows

Xanthus 159
Xenophilus 8, 28, 29–30, 159–160
Xerxes 110, 157, 182–185, 190–191, 205–218
character 116–117, 169, 185, 215–216
gifts 212–214
and women 19, 184–185, 214

Zarinaea **6**, 12, 13, 16, **84–100**
and Amazons 93–95
assassinates husband 13–14, 97–99
civilizing influence 84–85, 99
seductive 18, 92–93, 99, 100
and Semiramis 84–85, 100
at war 16, 84, 92–93, 95, 100
Zeus' mistresses 46–47, 49
Zopyrus 210
Zoroastrianism 118